

The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THE past months have shown a lightening of the dark clouds that have hung over us for so long. It becomes clearer that such massive powers of destruction have been brought under such control that a great war has become self defeating as an instrument of policy. It is true that new weapons and methods of war have more than once tempted men to believe that war could be outlawed from civilized society, and there will always be the problem of preventing small wars from becoming great ones, but now everybody knows that there can be released destructive powers whose ultimate effects could not be controlled. However short a major war might be the winners themselves would have no certainty of survival and in any case would take over only a waste of problems. Even a new Hitler or Stalin would hesitate at the contemplation of tyrannizing over a poisoned world as empty as the moon.

It is little enough to congratulate ourselves upon, but for what it is we may be grateful for our children's sake. A world from which the fear of war has gone will have its own great tasks of attacking the poverty of the great majority of mankind, and to this can be brought not only the new physical powers which are emerging but minds from which the corroding fears we have known will have passed away.

It is written of King David that he "could not build an house to the name of the Lord his God for the wars that were about him on every side," but of Solomon the Lord had said "Thy son whom I will set upon thy throne in thy room, he shall build an house unto my name."

* * *

Dr. John Marsh has recently made the excellent suggestion that instead of passing woolly resolutions at our occasional assemblies a permanent Free Church Commission on Public Affairs should be set up for the information and guidance of our people and for the expression of the convictions of the Free Churches as occasion demands. He points out that the Anglican Church through its bishops in the House of Lords can and does express the judgments of that Church on matters

of high policy. The late Archbishop of York, for example, did immense service to the Church and the country in relating Christian opinion to the living questions of social and political life. But if we are to express our convictions as Free Churchmen, as we ought, they should be grounded in a knowledge of the facts and after adequate consideration.

There is, too, the further fact that while we are grateful for the leadership of the great Church organizations of the country and the world it is important that the councils and officers should be informed of the workings of the consciences of the Christian people from whom they derive their authority and in whose name they speak.

We hope Dr. Marsh's suggestion will not be allowed to lapse.

* * *

The office of Secretary to the Congregational Union of England and Wales has grown greatly in influence and ministerial authority among us in recent years. The opportunities of the office and the increasing demands upon it were recognised during the harsh days of the first great war when J. D. Jones was appointed Honorary Secretary to supplement the work of R. J. Wells in equipping our churches for their work in a rapidly changing environment. Dr. Sidney Berry's long tenure established the Secretary as a minister as well as a Secretary, and Dr. Leslie Cooke while giving so much of his power and wisdom to our domestic affairs took us into our place in the ecumenical movement not only without loss to our own special witness but to our very great gain.

The induction of the Reverend Howard S. Stanley following his election by the Assembly in May preserves, we hope and believe, a great succession. The present responsibilities of leadership in churches and among people who are expected, and expect, to make their own conscientious decisions and judgments under the guidance of the Holy Spirit impose a great burden upon any man, however gifted. Every minister knows how much he depends upon the prayerful goodwill of his people. If he is to give he must receive. Mr. Stanley deserves well of us for the ministerial and administrative work he has done especially in Lancashire and in the organization of the Maintenance of the Ministry Fund. As our Secretary he will deepen our debt to him and worthily represent us where our voice should be heard.

* * *

The resurgence of the persecution of Protestants in Spain and in South America is a pitiable example of the arrogance of power in Roman Catholic countries, and of the fear of

enlightenment that always accompanies totalitarian claims in spiritual as in political life. When totalitarianism is seen naked as in Hitler's Germany and Stalin's Russia it is ugly and fearful; when it assumes ecclesiastical robes its nature does not change. When in the midst of the struggle against Nazism President Roosevelt enunciated the Four Freedoms for which it was right, if need be, to die, freedom of worship was one of them. The Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations Organization claims it as one of the rights of civilized man. The present government of Spain denies it. It also makes it impossible for the Bible Society to print and distribute the Scriptures in the vernacular. This is not, of course, a new difficulty, as was shown in Mr. Sydney Moore's article in this journal in April 1954, but recently officials of the Spanish Ministry of Information seized the stocks at the Society's premises of some 9,000 copies of the New Testament and a further 20,000 copies of separate Gospels.

When these facts were given in the House of Lords, Viscount Stansgate added that since the Vatican control in Poland had been removed more than a million copies of the Scriptures had been supplied by the Society to Warsaw.

* * *

This attitude to liberty of thought and worship is its own commentary on the pretensions of the Roman Catholic Church to be the bulwark of Europe's defence against Communism. Two totalitarian systems confront one another. The triumph of either would begin a new Dark Age. It is not impossible that the Church that made a concordat with Mussolini and was neutral towards Hitler would for a sufficient price make terms with the Soviet Russia. The Protestant Churches still have work to do as well as a witness to bear. In *The Modern Churchman* (March) appears an article on "The Legacy of the Reformation" by Professor Norman Sykes which ought not to be missed. "Although the form of the Protestant legacy has changed radically," he writes, "its essential content remains the same. The principles of the absolute authority of the Bible as the foundation of Christian faith and praxis, of the performance of divine worship in a language understood of the people, of the priesthood of all believers (of which the professional ministry is representative), of the rights of the laity in the Church, of the unity of the Word and Sacraments, and of Justification by Faith: these remain as the positive and permanent legacy of the Reformation."

"Meantime," he continues, "the emergence of the modern totalitarian State, with its tremendous powers of indoctrination through its monopoly of education and of such agencies

as broadcasting, and with its own this-wordly ideology, has presented the legatees of the Reformation with novel and formidable problems." But he sees in "such practical successes" as the Ecumenical Movement and the World Council of Churches, and local experiments in reunion "a bold attempt to reverse the fissiparous tendencies which have characterized the history of Protestantism" and concludes with a reference to the phrase in the Epistle to the Ephesians that by "the many coloured wisdom of God" this is the attempt to knit together again the riven fragments of the seamless robe of Christ.

* * *

For this reason, as for many others, we wish well to the Anglican and Methodist Churches in their examination of their situation in regard to one another. In preparation for these conversations *The Holborn Review and London Quarterly* in its April number prints a symposium of eight articles dealing with reunion from the Methodist side. 'The problem of the ministry' emerges, as it is bound to do, and there is nothing in these articles that is not covered by Professor J. K. S. Reid in his *The Biblical Doctrine of the Ministry* on which we commented in our last issue. The same point is seen in the Reverend K. L. Parry's Moderatorial address to the Free Church Federal Council, which we are glad to be able to print in later pages. There is no final refusal to 'take episcopacy into our systems.' We Congregationalists certainly already have it. No one could fail to realise that who was present at the Service of Induction of the new Secretary of our Union on the day following his election. Mr. Stanley was solemnly inducted by the Chairman of the Union—a woman—in the presence of a great concourse of representatives of local churches with the retiring acting Secretary, Dr. Berry, assisting and the Moderator for Wales & Monmouth representing his fellow Moderators. Mr. Stanley was asked to assume the care of the Union and the Assembly was asked to accept him. Whether such a form is 'regular' or 'valid' is beside the point. The fact was not to be missed by anyone present. There are parallels in other Free Churches. Here is our acknowledgment that 'episcopacy' is of the *bene esse* of the Church, but we are as far as Professor Reid and the Presbyterians, and most of the Methodists from meaning that this or any kind of episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Church, in the sense that without the bishop there is no church. How far does this satisfy the Archbishop? We do not know.

Another aspect of 'the problem of the ministry' is that the

Presbyterians, like ourselves, now admit women to the ministry. The Lower House of Convocation recently rejected such a proposal, as did the Lambeth Conference for the whole Anglican Communion when the proposal was made by the Chinese Church.

* * *

The Editor of *The Modern Churchman* suggests a fresh approach in his March number, that the bishops of the Church of England (not the Anglican Communion) should take an immediate first step as an earnest of their desire for reunion by "declaring that all Methodist communicants are most welcome to communicate at the Lord's Table in the National Church, and not only Methodists but all Free Church communicants should they desire to do so," and adds the further suggestion that the four great English Free Churches, the Congregationalists, Baptists, English Presbyterians, and Methodists should re-enter the National Church as Christian Corporations retaining their property, their buildings, their ministries and their organizations and powers of self-government, and only making such alterations in these as may be from time to time territorially demanded for the perfecting of their co-operation with our Anglican diocesan and parochial system. In short that they should possess and retain, after their reunion with the National Church, the degree of corporate independence, identity of objective, characteristic liturgical devotion, initiative of missionary enterprise such as is possessed and retained by the great Religious Orders—Benedictines, Carmelites, Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuits—in the Roman Catholic Church." Mr. Kenneth Parry makes the same point in his Free Church Federal Council address.

The 'problem of the ministry' is created by a theory of episcopacy to which Free Churchmen can never subscribe because it has insufficient warrant in Scripture and has suffered many historical vicissitudes and also because it denies the reality of the presence of the Holy Spirit in the life of the Free Churches in England and throughout the world.

* * *

As we write it is still possible to hope that Mr. Macmillan's proposal to issue Premium Bonds will be withdrawn in deference to the widespread objection to them from the great majority of Christian people in this country and from those who share the responsibility for the moral instruction of young people. To say that the financial crisis justifies the resort to this sordid appeal to cupidity is to confuse the simple-minded who at the same time are being told it is in hard work, tem-

perate spending and a deeper sense of responsibility throughout our industrial life that our hope lies.

It is true that only the interest on these bonds will constitute the stake and provide the comparatively small prizes. The Chancellor and Lord Mackintosh have said that their consciences are clear because the capital sums invested are not affected—"You can't lose." You will lose the interest, of course, in return for a slim chance of winning a £1,000. At the worst, they say, such a little flutter cannot be called gambling. That was the defence of the young lady who excused the baby who needed explanation by pleading that it was only a little one!

The principle is bad. It acknowledges in order to exploit the element of chance in human affairs and appeals to cupidity which is personally degrading and socially harmful. That gambling of this kind, small stakes that carry a remote chance of large prizes, is permeating our national life is a fact to deplore and combat, not to encourage and exploit. If these Premium Bonds are to justify their introduction financially it will be because large numbers of people engage themselves in a perpetual 'little flutter.' Mr. Raymond Chandler may be surprised to be quoted in these sober pages. In his vigorous thriller, *The Long Goodbye*, one of his few honest 'cops' declares, "I hate gamblers. I hate them the way I hate dope pushers. They pander to a disease that is every bit as corrupting as dope. You think those palaces in Reno and Vegas are just for harmless fun? Nuts; they're for the little guy, the something for nothing sucker. . . . The rich gambler doesn't make the big racket. The big steal is in dimes and quarters. The big racket comes in like water from the pipe in your bathroom, a steady stream that never stops flowing . . . legal gambling, clean, honest business, state approved. So it's right is it? Not by my book. Because it's gambling and it breeds gamblers, and when you add it all up there's only one kind of gambling—the wrong kind."

Mr. Macmillan has strayed into bad company. We hope he gets out quickly.

* * *

A meeting of Heads of Colleges was being held at Oxford. At dinner someone wondered how such a gathering might be described. A pride of lions, a charm of goldfinches, a congregation of angels . . . "Why not," said a voice, "a lac of principals."

THE FREE CHURCH CONTRIBUTION TO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH¹

By KENNETH L. PARRY, B.Sc.

SIXTY years is not a long time as you turn the pages of history, but the last sixty years have seen more changes in our national life, indeed in the life of mankind, than any previous sixty years which history records. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever ; it is our task to show that the truth as it is in Jesus is relevant to the world in which we live.

Sixty years ago, when I was a boy at Merchant Taylors' Grammar School, Great Crosby, we used to hear a great deal about religious indifference. I do not think it would be true to say that religious indifference is the special characteristic of our time. People are intensely interested in religion. They are looking to religion to answer those deep questions of human destiny and the purpose of life which are daily with us "upon whom the ends of the world have come." They are looking to religion but they are not yet looking to the Churches. If you compare the statistics of Church going to-day with 60 years ago the result is disappointing and you might think we were living in an irreligious age. I believe you would be wrong. At the Jerusalem conference in 1928 Dr. Rufus Jones said : " Religion has a far wider range than the dogmatists are willing to admit. There are a great many persons who in their hearts and in their daily lives climb Sinais and even Calvaries, although their names are on no church register. The organic forms and systems of religion do not contain all the piety or all the truth or all the goodness that exist. Men and women live for high and noble ends outside the Church as well as inside it." That needed to be said, and it is still true. Our problem is twofold—not only how to draw sinners into the Church but how to attract the saints.

There can be no doubt that one great obstacle is the disunity of the Church. I have never forgotten our experience in the " Religion and Life " campaign. One object of that movement was to appeal to the non-churchgoer. It met with considerable success. People said to us, "If that is what Christianity stands for I should like to join the Church. Where is it ? " They did not want to be Anglicans or Methodists or Congregationalists—they wanted to be Christians. There is no matter before us so urgent as this of unity.

¹ The Moderator's address (in part) to the Diamond Jubilee Congress of the Free Church Federal Council in Liverpool, March 1956.

But our main consideration here is the witness of the Free Churches. We are Evangelical Free Churches. Every word in that title has its significance.

We are Evangelical Churches. Lord Morley once said that "labels are devices for saving talkative persons the trouble of thinking." The word 'evangelical' has been used as a label to describe a particular movement or a particular type of religious experience, but it is used here of those who believe that the Church was created by the Gospel and lives by the Gospel and exists to bear witness to the Gospel. The true relation of the Church to the Gospel was never more forcibly expressed than by Bernard Manning. "We are not to think of our Lord as founding a society first and secondly giving it a message, a commission, an authority, in such a way that if we have the Church we may be sure that we have the Gospel in what it says. The order is precisely the reverse. The beginning is the Good News of Jesus Christ the Son of God. The Church is the creation, not the proprietor of the Good News. The Gospel is not what the Church proclaims; the Church is that which proclaims the Gospel." The question is sometimes asked, which comes first, the Bible or the Church? When our fathers in the faith appealed to the Bible the answer was that the Bible as we know it, the Christian Bible, is the gift of the Church; the Church gave us the Bible. To which we answer, there was that which gave us both the Bible and the Church, namely, the Gospel.

We are Evangelical Churches. That does not mean that we stand for any particular interpretation of the Gospel. It was John Wesley who said "I find more profit in sermons on either good tempers or good works than in what are vulgarly called 'gospel sermons.' That term has become a mere cant word: I wish that none of our society would use it." The most sacred word can be degraded. May I remind you of the famous saying of Dr. Deissmann: "The word Gospel is one of the greatest spiritual treasures that are entrusted to English speaking Christendom." This priority of the Gospel determines our way of worship.

In a series of broadcast addresses on "The Hope of the World" William Temple said a very striking thing. "I am disposed to begin by making what many people will feel to be a quite outrageous statement. This world can be saved from political chaos and collapse by one thing only, and that is worship." How right he was. As Romilly Micklem says: "Doubtless the Church has much to do, but in order that she may accomplish anything she must live, and her life depends on her worship." We are Nonconformists because we refused

to conform to the Act of Uniformity, and the Act of Uniformity concerns worship. It was an attempt to impose the Book of Common Prayer upon all the churches and to exclude any other form of worship. To us worship is our response in adoration and penitence to the Gospel of God's redeeming grace. That is why we attach such importance to preaching. This emphasis upon preaching goes back to the days of the Puritans. "On no defect of the state of the Church," says Bishop Paget, "did the Puritans insist with more justice than the lack of preaching, and the wrong done to the people by clergy who were non-resident or unlearned." There was plenty of preaching of a kind in the 17th century, as Miss Richardson shows in her fascinating book, *English Preachers and Preaching, 1640-1670*. "Going to Church in the 17th century," she says, "was a pleasantly automatic performance which might or might not be connected with conviction of sin and desire for spiritual development. Most people went to church, and they went after the Restoration hardly less than during the Commonwealth. 'Tis most true,' says Selden philosophically, 'that all men are equally given to their pleasure, only thus, one man's pleasure lies one way, and another's another—he that takes pleasure to hear sermons, enjoys himself as much as he that hears plays'." But these highly entertaining discourses or the official homilies which were the most you could expect in an ordinary Parish Church were not what the Puritans understood by preaching, as "a dying man to dying men," in Richard Baxter's classic phrase.

We need ministers who can interpret to the modern mind the unsearchable riches of Christ. May we not take it for granted that no academic training, no brilliant scholarship, no intellectual power is any substitute for piety and godliness and Christian faith? But I cannot think that men who are to teach us to love God with all our mind and to hold the truth as it is in Jesus in the context of modern thought need any less intellectual training than doctors or lawyers or any other of the great professions. We are Evangelical Churches, Gospel Churches. Surely we might expect that it is to the Free Churches that the people look to hear what we so desperately need, the Good News of salvation for a world that knows not the things which belong to its peace. Eric Fenn, speaking out of his vast experience with the B.B.C., says, "The parson is like a man speaking from the other side of the great divide, and he often seems oblivious of the existence of that which separates him and his message from the common life of the men of to-day." Nothing do we need

more to-day than an order of preachers who can interpret to the modern mind the unsearchable riches of Christ.

The most distinctive characteristic of Free Church worship is what is generally known as extempore prayer. This too springs from the same root and is part of our evangelical tradition. To us the Church is a fellowship of believers who gather in response to the Gospel to offer up their prayers and praises to God. In his most valuable study of *Catholic and Protestant Elements in Christianity*, Canon Quick has a chapter on "Religious Consciousness." "A new consciousness of God is in the New Testament clearly seen to be the ground and basis of Christian life and power and this is confirmed by the experience of centuries. Conscious faith comes first; conduct proceeds from it. On the other hand the consciousness can be prepared for and helped to grow by first doing the acts which are appropriate to it, even before it comes." He finds here the defence of a more liturgical order of service. But the emphasis with us is the Christian experience of God's redeeming grace in Christ, and this determines our worship.

For 300 years, apart from the Churches of our tradition, there would have been no prayers in the public worship of this country except those in the Book of Common Prayer. That surely would have been an inestimable loss. Soon after R.J. Campbell left us I went to hear him preach in Birmingham Parish Church. There was no difference in the preaching. He had lost none of his power in the pulpit; those searching eyes, the silvery voice, the incisive eloquence, the spiritual genius, it was all there. But when the sermon was over he turned to the altar and recited a collect, and I remembered those wonderful prayers which in his City Temple days uplifted us to the very throne of grace. Dr. Selbie used to tell of a woman who said how sorry she was that her minister was retiring. He was very old and rather wooden and most of his people thought it was time for him to retire. Dr. Selbie said to her. "Were you one of those who liked his preaching?" "I never listened to his preaching," she said, "but I don't know how I am going to live without his prayers." We all know that this gift of extempore prayer can be abused. Indeed it may be said to have this at least in common with Christianity that it is like salt. When it loses its savour it is good for nothing but the dung hill. Dr. Forsyth once said that our losses to the Established Church are more due to the abuse of the principle of free prayer than to any other single cause. One hesitates to criticise any man's prayers so long as he is sincere, but really it is impossible to imagine that some of these chatty and informative prayers one hears are addressed

to the eternal God. God is our Father, yes, and we approach Him with the simple trust of a child, but He is a Holy Father, the all-great and the all-loving too, and we must worship Him with reverence and awe. By free prayer we do not mean unprepared prayer. Isaac Watts drew a distinction between what he called "conceived or free prayer and the extempore utterance of the moment." It is a great gift to be able to lead the congregation in prayer at the very moment at which they have arrived in the course of the service, which is the literal meaning of extempore; but as Isaac Watts says, utterances of this kind are more properly expressed in ejaculatory form. For sustained prayer no preparation can be too careful. In his famous *Lectures on Preaching* Dr. Dale says: "Before you have been very long in the ministry I think it very likely that your public prayers will occasion you great perplexity and humiliation. Your courage will, perhaps, fail altogether, and you will begin to ask whether your people would tolerate a liturgy. Happily the traditions and instincts of our congregations have saved us from the mistake into which our weakness might have betrayed us. Reflection and experience have convinced me that it would hardly be possible to inflict a worse injury on the life and power of our churches than to permit free, extemporaneous prayer to be excluded from our services or even to be relegated to an inferior position. We need not despair. We too have received the Holy Ghost. He did not forsake the Church when the great saints of former ages passed away; and if we rely on His inspiration, and devote to the substance, the spirit, and the form of this part of the service the thought and the care which it ought to receive, our difficulties will soon be diminished and perhaps in time they will disappear altogether." Those words are as true today as when they were uttered 80 years ago.

Another great feature of our Free Church worship is the singing of hymns. Nothing is more characteristic of Protestant worship than the congregational hymn. As Dr. Millar Patrick says: "According to the Roman theory of worship all that is essential is done for the congregation by the clergy. The worship does not emanate from the people but from the priest who mediates for them. If hymns are permitted at all it is as an extra, a concession, and always outside the main ordinance of worship. Against this sacerdotal theory Luther asserted the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers. 'The substance of worship' Luther said, 'is that our dear Lord speaks with us through His Holy Word, and we in return speak with Him through prayer and song of praise'." The Calvinists, as we know, restricted the language of worship to Holy Scrip-

ture and would allow only Metrical Psalms. This is a glorious tradition preserved to us by the Presbyterians. But Isaac Watts delivered us from what might have become the tyranny of the Metrical Psalm and, in his own words, "made David sing like a Christian," and in his *Hymns and Spiritual Songs* gave us some of the greatest hymns in the language. John Wesley died with a hymn of Watts upon his lips, but it was Isaac Watts who said that Charles Wesley's "Come O Thou traveller" was worth all the verses he had written. So the Free Churches of this country, like the early Church, became a "Singing Church" and have been so ever since.

I wonder if we make as much as we might and should of this great inheritance. I am more often in the pew these days than I have been since I became a minister and I am distressed to find how feeble our worship often is. We ministers who generally stand near the choir do not realise how dim is the voice of praise in the congregation. We are told that one of the most popular of all the B.B.C. programmes is the community singing of hymns on Sunday evening. If some of these listeners were to come to church would they be disappointed? And how careful we should be as to what hymns we sing. Most people get their theology from the hymns rather than the sermon. In his searching little book, *As Tommy sees us*, Herbert Gray has a chapter on hymns. "Where do they get their notion that religion is a sickly thing? Where do they get their disastrous misconception of Jesus? Whence comes their common impression that a Christian is a prig? When we examine the section of our hymn book specially reserved for children's hymns the answer stares us in the face." But alas! this criticism applies not only to children's hymns. There are many sub-christian doctrines which have long disappeared from our pulpits which still survive in some of our hymns. As to the tunes I cannot forbear to quote the classic words of Vaughan Williams in his preface to the *English Hymnal*. "The usual argument in favour of bad music is that the fine tunes are doubtless musically correct but that the people want something simple. Now the expression 'musically correct' has no meaning; the only 'correct' music is that which is beautiful and noble. As for simplicity what could be simpler than St. Anne or the Old Hundredth; and what could be finer? It is indeed a moral rather than a musical issue. No doubt it requires a certain effort to tune oneself to the moral atmosphere implied by a fine melody. It is far easier to dwell in the miasma of the languishing and sentimental hymn tunes which so often disfigure our services. Such poverty of heart may not be

uncommon, but at least it should not be encouraged by those who direct the services of the Church ; it ought no longer to be true anywhere that the most exalted moments of a church-goer's week are associated with music that would not be tolerated in any place of secular entertainment." No doubt Vaughan Williams had in mind people brought up on *Hymns Ancient and Modern*. I can think of other hymn books which would not lend themselves to this abuse. Hearty congregational singing is one thing we expect to find in any Free Church ; let us be faithful to our great inheritance.

Canon Streeter expresses his surprise that in spite of the liberty of variation enjoyed, the average service in a Scottish Presbyterian or English Nonconformist church follows so closely certain stereotyped and conventional lines. It is sometimes forgotten that our order of worship has a long tradition behind it. It came from Geneva and derives from the early worship of the synagogue. We greatly value that tradition, but we must not be enslaved by it and perhaps we should be bolder than we are in making innovations. But do let us have regard to what Romilly Micklem calls " the architecture of a service." You don't put a Norman arch in the middle of a Gothic nave. I have known some Free Churches where they introduce bits of the Prayer Book, having versicles and responses, but with no sense of liturgical order. There is much to be said for the dictum of Mrs. Thomas Carlyle that " it is the mixture of things which is the great bad." I am not convinced that an extempore prayer would be in place in the Prayer Book service of a Parish church.

And now I want to make a confession, if so it may seem. Much as I love the way of worship in which I have been brought up, there is also that in me which finds satisfaction in a more liturgical order of service, in what Dr. Dale describes as " the stateliness, the majesty, the aesthetic beauty " of the Anglican service. I will go further and say that there is something in the Roman Catholic service of Benediction which I find profoundly moving. It is sometimes said that it is a matter of temperament whether we enjoy this or that type of worship. It goes deeper than that. There is in me a Protestant and a Catholic and an Evangelical. One of the reasons why unity is so urgent is that we of the Free Churches are missing something vital and precious if we never worship with our brethren in the Anglican Church. And I am sure they have much to gain by worshipping with us.

We are Evangelical Churches, and we are Free Churches. It seems to be thought in some quarters that we have weakened in our conviction that the Church should be free from State

control. On the contrary, we were never more convinced that the control of the Church by the State is bad for religion and bad for the State. If we say less about it today it is because it is being said from within the Church of England. "There are features of the present Establishment in England," said Dr. Temple, "which seem to me to be intolerable. The Church as a fellowship of worshippers ought to have absolute freedom to order its own worship without any restriction from persons and representatives of persons who may or may not be members of that fellowship." A few years ago one of our Deans showed me a prayer that someone had sent to him. "It is a beautiful prayer, is it not?" he said to me. "Yes," I replied, "are you going to use it in the Cathedral?" "Yes," he said, "I shall use it next Sunday." "Mr. Dean," I said, "our fathers went to prison and to death, because you would not let them do just that." It seems to us intolerable that the worship of the Church should be controlled by Act of Parliament. It is still more wrong that the Bishops should condone what is illegal.

It is disconcerting to find lawlessness in a Church established by law. The whole position has indeed become intolerable. But is it quite fair for the Church of England to say to us: "We want the freedom you enjoy; of course you will help us to get it?" In all humility we answer, "With a great price obtained we this freedom. Either you must come out as we did, or you must take us in." Shortly before he died Dr. Temple said to me: "What I want to see in this country is a really National Church, enjoying the complete spiritual autonomy of the Church of Scotland, but I want to see that Church contain not only the present Church of England, but the great Free Churches as well."

But it is not only in the interests of religion, but in the interest of true democracy that we demand freedom for the Church. A few years ago a little book was published by John Macmurray called *A Challenge to the Churches*. He speaks of the increasing range of political control over our national life, especially in the economic field. "It might be said," he goes on, "that if the economic organization of life is handed over to the State in addition to its function of maintaining law and order, nothing of any consequence remains outside the field of political authority. The State which controls industry and finance is all powerful and of necessity totalitarian. That is not so. So long as the field of religion is excluded from the competence of political authority, everything is excluded which democracy requires. Religion could of itself enforce the limitations of political authority which democracy demands.

Indeed in the long run only religion is capable of doing this." These are impressive words. We might not all of us go so far as John Macmurray in accepting the complete control by the State of industry and economics, but how right he is in the supreme importance he attaches to religious freedom.

In our own *Report on Church and State* we say that "though Free Churchmen reject the State control of religion, they welcome State recognition of religion. We do not desire to see a secular State in England." To which I would add that we not only welcome the State recognition of religion, but we welcome the religious recognition of the State as the instrument of God. I remember what a shock it was to me when I read in one of Dr. Dale's books many years ago that when he was young, people of the Evangelical school used to take part in an election, if at all, with an uneasy conscience, with the sort of feeling they had about going to the theatre. G. W. E. Russell tells of a certain Captain Trotter, a converted Life Guardsman, who incurred this censure from an evangelical friend: "I am sorry to find Trotter going into the House of Commons. Who ever went in there, and came out better in his soul? It is almost as bad as throwing his park open for a Temperance society." But it was a Puritan who said that "it is part of a man's religion to see that his country is well governed." We stand to-day in that tradition.

I know no finer statement of the spiritual freedom of the Church than that which is claimed and enjoyed by the Church of Scotland. May I remind you of the terms of it? "The Church of Scotland, as part of the universal Church wherein the Lord Jesus Christ has appointed a government in the hands of Church office-bearers, receives from Him and Him alone, the right and power, subject to no civil authority, to legislate and to adjudicate finally in all matters of doctrine, worship, government and discipline." It declares that "State recognition of the Church does not affect the character of this government as derived from the divine head of the Church alone." There are important differences between the position in Scotland and in England. The Church of Scotland did not receive its spiritual autonomy from the State, it claimed it as a right. And in the Church of Scotland the voice of the laity has a place in the constitution which in the Church of England is only expressed through Parliament. But if, as Dr. Temple suggested, the National Church were to embrace not only the present Church of England but the Free Churches as well the whole position would be altered.

We are Evangelical Free Churches. We are Evangelical, we are Free, but above all we are Churches. In a discussion

on the Lambeth *Joint Report on Church Unity*, Archbishop Lang said, "There are two fundamental conceptions of the Church, between which a decisive choice must be made. Is it created by an association of men, or of societies of men, who accept the Gospel declared by Christ, or give their allegiance to His teaching and example; or is it created by God, a Body or organism of which Christ Himself is the constitutive principle, which men do not form, but into which they are brought? Is it based upon the assent of men, or societies of men, to the Gospel as God's redemptive purpose for mankind; or is it itself part of that redemptive purpose? The whole problem of unity depends upon that choice." The joint statement, he says, makes that decisive choice: "The foundation of the Church rests not upon the will or consent or beliefs of men, whether as individuals or societies, but upon the creative will of God." Dr. Lang seemed surprised that the representatives of the Free Churches should have agreed to that. I doubt whether we should have agreed to it so readily when the Free Church Council was founded 60 years ago. In his study of the Evangelical Revival Dr. Dale says that "the idea of the Church, for which the early Congregationalists cared so much that they endured imprisonment, exile, and even death in the attempt to realise it, was almost swept away by the vehement tide of the Evangelical movement." There is a type of Evangelicalism which is individualistic and which regards the Church as a voluntary society of converted people. This was never true of the Methodists. To John and Charles Wesley the Church was the Church of England, and since their separation the Methodists have always held a high doctrine of the Church. Still less is it true of the older Dissent. The Presbyterians and the Independents were cradled in Calvinism with its high doctrine of the Church as the holy people of God. In the words of the *Savoy Declaration*, "The Lord Jesus calleth out of the world into communion with Himself those that are given unto Him by His Father, that they may walk before Him in all the ways of obedience which He prescribeth to them in His Word." One of the most remarkable changes I have seen in my lifetime has been the recovery among us of this high doctrine of the Church. There are many reasons for it but the supreme reason is the intensive study of the New Testament. After all it was to the New Testament that we made our appeal. "To Caesar thou hast appealed, to Caesar thou shalt go." And in the New Testament the Church, in Carnegie Simpson's phrase, is "part of the fact of Christ."

But was Archbishop Lang right when he said that the whole question is whether the Church is an association of men

or is created by God? Is not the vital question, What was the nature of the Church that God created? Was it an ecclesiastical institution or was it a fellowship? If I may quote Bernard Manning again, "The Gospel is not what the Church proclaims: the Church is that which proclaims the Gospel." But he goes on: "The two are very closely connected. It is indeed impossible in thought or in history to divide them. The Good News, preached and personified by the Saviour, at once produces the fellowship among those who receive it and Him. This fellowship is the Church, and they are right who maintain that outside the Church there is no salvation in the full Christian meaning of that great word. For you cannot have the Good News of salvation without getting at once into the fellowship of the Church. Christian experience is ecclesiastical experience." Let us put it in another way. Do you become a Christian by joining the Church, or do you join the Church because you are a Christian? Surely the answer is neither. There is that which makes both, the Gospel. The fruit of the Gospel is the Fellowship of believers.

But this conception of the Church as a fellowship in Christ carries with it the conviction that the Church must be one. The Archbishop of Canterbury has suggested that as a step towards closer union we should "take episcopacy into our systems." Dr. Fisher is in his own person the embodiment of the spirit of brotherly love in Christ and he earnestly desires our closer unity. The difficulty as we all know is to define this episcopacy which we are to take into our systems. We are told that we are not being asked to accept any particular theory of episcopacy. But if you say that no man can be a minister of the Word and the Sacraments unless he has been ordained by a bishop, and a bishop in what is called the Apostolic succession, then that surely is a theory. I am quite prepared to believe that the episcopacy can be an organ of the Fellowship, but if I am asked to believe that the episcopacy determines the Fellowship I find no authority for it in the New Testament or in history. I remember Dr. Franks saying to me many years ago, "There is a lot to be said for bishops, it's the priest we are afraid of." Isn't that the real issue? Dr. Orchard tells us that he was ordained by a bishop because "no Presbyterian would claim that his ordination gave authority to celebrate the Eucharist as a propitiatory sacrifice." No Free Church minister would desire or accept such authority. Some of those who do not subscribe to the more rigid views of Apostolic succession tell us that they value episcopal ordination as the symbol of continuity. But we too value continuity. How can I accept an authority to admin-

ister the sacraments which would exclude Isaac Watts? He would be there among the great cloud of witnesses. But if he appeared in the flesh he would be excluded.

May I suggest another formula to "taking episcopacy into our systems"? Suppose we take our systems into episcopacy. I was brought up on Allen's *Christian Institutions*. I remember the impression made upon me as a student by his comparison of the Free Church denominations in this country with the various monastic orders. "The Methodist Church is almost a reproduction of the Franciscan order, and Wesley as it were the successor of St. Francis of Assisi, taking the world as his parish, with his ardent love of souls. The Congregational churches appear like a reversion to the earlier and simpler organisation of the Benedictine order, where each monastery was independent and complete in itself, an order which rivalled, if not surpassed, the Dominican in learning and scholarship." The Baptist churches suggested to him the Carmelites, "an order whose extensive membership exhibited a devotion and enthusiasm which was not surpassed in monastic annals. And how many lesser orders there were, who had learned the truth that God speaks to the soul in silence, and that in silent prayer and silent worship, the spirit is active." In some such way as this it seems to me that these churches of ours could be embraced within a national Church and yet maintain the links we so much value with the members of these societies throughout the world.

Many years ago Dr. Arnold Thomas of Bristol gave an address in Bristol Cathedral on Congregationalism. His closing words made a profound impression. "It may be that no change in the situation will take place in my time, but standing here to-day, in this historic building, the mother Church of my native city, I will say that had I been a younger man I should have looked forward with the keenest pleasure, and not without some confidence, to a happy day when I should worship within these walls as one rejoicing in his own inheritance:

No more a stranger and a guest

But as a child at home."

That was nearly 30 years ago. How eagerly have I hoped that I might be that younger man who should see the fulfilment of his vision. In 1962 we shall be celebrating the 300th anniversary of the Act of Uniformity. Is it too much to hope that we shall celebrate it not by reviving ancient controversies but by a great act of reunion? Matthew Arnold thought we made a great mistake to come out. We ought to have remained within the Church of England and influenced it from within. Whatever influence we might have had from within we have

had a profound influence from without. We came out on the Act of Uniformity. Who believes in uniformity today, even within the Church of England? We claimed the freedom of the Church from State control. It is from within the Church of England itself that the demand for freedom is heard most loudly. Surely the time has come to realise the dream of William Temple of a national Church acknowledging no authority over its life and worship but Christ and embracing not only the present Church of England but the great Free Churches as well.

There are some among us who see more hope of a united Free Church. That it would be possible for us to unite without the sacrifice of anything that is vital in our various denominations, I am deeply convinced. I once ventured to say that if the Free Churches could discover what holds them apart and the Anglican Church could discover what holds it together we should find the secret of reunion. Is it not a fact that the only real difference between the Free Church denominations today is a difference of organization? But to set organization above life and fellowship in the Gospel is the ground of our complaint against institutionalism. That we should unite seems so obvious that there must be some reason why it has been found so difficult. May it be because there is so little to inspire the imagination? What Dr. Dodd has called "the non-theological barriers to reunion" will only be overcome by a vision of the Great Church embracing all that is true in the Protestant and Catholic traditions and witnessing to the unity of all mankind in the Body of Christ.

But let me close with the words of one of the greatest of all Free Churchmen, John Owen, "If ever we intend to take one step towards any agreement or unity, it must be by fixing this principle in the minds of all men—that it is of no advantage to any man, whatever church or way in Christian religion he be of, unless he personally believes the promises, and live in obedience unto all the precepts of Christ; and that for him who does so, it is a trampling of the whole Gospel underfoot to say that his salvation could be endangered by his not being of this or that church or way. Would Christians of all parties make it their business to retrieve its reputation, wherein also their own bliss and happiness is involved, it would insensibly sink a thousand of their differences underground. The old, glorious, beautiful face of Christianity would be restored to it again."

NONCONFORMITY IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

By The Rt. Hon. J. CHUTER EDE, P.C., C.H., M.P.

I WAS born and reared a Congregationalist and, ecclesiastically, have remained one¹. My mother taught me that nonconformity was a duty. The dead fish went with the stream. Mankind made progress when resolute men and women dared to think, and then determinedly to act, for themselves. Thus, with devoted, adventurous minds, they sought out and applied further revelations of truth. There had been a vague belief that I might enter the ministry, but the violent shock of going from a fundamentalist church to sit under the late W. B. Selbie at Cambridge so disturbed my mind that such a career seemed conscientiously improper. I threw my spiritual energies into politics, which were not in my mother's mind and life separated from religion. Robust radicalism was the practical application of intelligent nonconformity.

Since William Langland saw the vision of *Piers Plowman*, that is for over six hundred years, the real division in English life has been between the nonconformists and the authoritarians. Slowly, but surely, the English have discovered that the enforcement of uniformity does not produce unity. The democratic way of life depends for its current vigour and ultimate survival on an active and responsible nonconformity, applying in both the religious and secular spheres the results of its continuous search for truth. It must never forget the noble words written by Milton in the year of Marston Moor :

To be still searching what we know not, by what we know, still closing up truth to truth as we find it (for all her body is homogeneous, and proportional), this is the golden rule in theology as well as in arithmetic, and makes up the best harmony in a church ; not the forced and outward union of cold, and neutral, and inwardly divided minds.

Such virile nonconformity sustained not only the spiritual, but also the intellectual life of England during the dreary period of the eighteenth century when Oxford and Cambridge reached their lowest ebb. Then the dissenting academies and the nonconformist pulpits kept aflame the torch of truth and enabled it to lighten dark places. Macaulay, in a well-known passage, bears testimony to the standing of the nonconformist

¹ Mr. Chuter Ede is President of the International Association for Liberal Christianity and Religious Freedom.—Ed.

divines in the spiritual, political and intellectual life of that age :

Scarcely any member of a congregation of separatists entered into a partnership, married a daughter, put a son out as apprentice, or gave a vote at an election, without consulting his spiritual guide. On all political and literary questions the minister was the oracle of his own circle.

These men and their associates, with Priestley, Doddridge, Dalton and others on the staffs of the dissenting academies, inaugurated the scientific age in which our present generation lives.

As the inheritor of this high tradition of fearless and continuous research the modern nonconformist has a special responsibility for the preservation of the freedom of outlook and liberty of utterance by which our spiritual ancestors pushed outwards and upwards the boundaries of man's knowledge of God's universe. Scientific authoritarianism and exclusiveness can develop as dangerously as any religious or political authoritarianism of the past. Recent developments and happenings sound grave warnings. The pursuit of scientific research has become astoundingly expensive. Seeking for revelation in the world of natural phenomena the early workers just mentioned employed inexpensive apparatus, generally home-made, which no secondary modern school, maintained out of rates, would regard as adequate for demonstration purposes. These men published their results unreservedly to the whole wide world. Each discovery at once became the property of all mankind who cared to accept it, and every other seeker in the same field received help in his own quest.

Research in the scientific field has grown so complicated and apparatus is so expensive that only wealthy States and great industrial corporations can indulge in it. The reluctance of Universities to run the risks inseparable from the acceptance of lavish grants from State funds has disappeared. Largesse from the Exchequer that would have been unbelievable in its scale at the beginning of this century is now gratefully accepted by the ancient and modern seats of learning. Research workers, whether in the University, the State establishment or the industrial concern, work under conditions of the strictest secrecy as to the findings which may crown their probings. Newly discovered truth no longer gets instant and free publication. Milton rated "the liberty to know, to utter, and to

argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties." Such a claim in the realms of science now falls on unresponsive ears. Were he now alive he might well comment that new scientist "is but old priest writ large."

Each nation concerned, each industrial corporation engaged, hopes by this method to keep just one jump ahead of its rival. Each fears that in some decisive detail it may be one jump behind. The advance of this secretly acquired, jealously guarded knowledge has created fear more intense than any known before. National leaders proclaim that this new knowledge has armed them with a physical power none of their predecessors has possessed. One wicked man could now loose irreparable devastation on the entire world. Before Pearl Harbour it was possible to accept the old saw that it took two to make a quarrel. Now one can launch global irretrievable disaster. (What a pity that at the same time we have not discovered the number required to build up the wastes of war.)

The fear produced by this elaborate secrecy has played havoc with our traditional standards of individual liberty. It bids fair to destroy our conception of individuality itself. We find ourselves again involved in the controversies our seventeenth century forbears knew so well. Major-General Crawford complained that one of Cromwell's officers was an Anabaptist—to the Presbyterian at once a heretic in religion and a subversive in politics. Through three hundred years sounds clear the assertion of eternal principle in the emphatic answer of the great military leader of English Independency :

Ay, but the man is an Anabaptist ! Are you sure of that ? Admit he be, shall that render him incapable to serve the public ? He is indiscreet. It may be so, in some things, we have all human infirmities. I tell you, if you had none but such indiscreet men about you, and would be pleased to use them kindly, you would find as good a fence to you as any you have yet chosen. Sir, the State, in choosing men to serve it, takes no notice of their opinions, if they be willing faithfully to serve them, that satisfies.

Compare that historic statement with the following quotation from the inquiry into the reliability of Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, the maker of the first atom bomb, when his suitability for further employment by the United States Government was under investigation :

It is not a case of proving the man is a danger. It is a case of thinking, well, he might be a danger, and it is

perfectly logical to presume that he would be, and that there is no consideration whatsoever to be given to any of his past performances or, you might say, the imperative usefulness.

Not all the ruling elements in the United States claim spiritual descent from the Pilgrim Fathers !

In these secret investigations in this country as well as in America not merely the individual's own character and beliefs are regarded as relevant and essential subjects of inquiry, but also those of the spouse, the relatives of both parties to the marriage and their associates. Even Major-General Crawford, zealot for uniformity as he was, does not seem to have considered the attitude to be adopted towards an orthodox officer with an Anabaptist wife. Shall we be able to preserve the Cromwellian standard which has been our yardstick in assessing the scope of the civil and religious liberty to which each human being has an inherent right? We may well have a grim fight if fear and secrecy intensify one another. The Parliamentary Army's camp, when Cromwell with his famous troops rode into it on the eve of Naseby, did not ring with the joyful shout, " Ironsides has come to lead us," because the soldiers thought a doctrinal purge was about to begin.

The Nonconformist pulpit had a gift of prophetic utterance which seems to have been lost. The voice which condemned " Abdul the Damned " has been silenced. When I was Home Secretary my duty was to preserve law and order and simultaneously maintain individual liberty. That is Nonconformity's endowment of the English way of life, for only in orderly liberty can freedom be secured. The Nonconformist in his relationship with public affairs declares allegiance to what Dr. Robert S. Paul in his book, *The Lord Protector*, calls the dual ethic of Puritanism. This involves the recognition that the Old Testament demand for righteousness and social justice had to be interpreted and applied in the light of the New Testament insistence on love. Modern problems have to be so considered and their solutions so sought.

The questions of colour and asylum might at any moment become tests of the bold application of sound historic principle. In the years immediately following the Second World War the admission of alien refugees from religious and political persecution was a great concern. Representations from the Jewish community and the Roman Catholic Church, both clearly interested for co-religionists, and from Unitarians on behalf of those suffering persecution from extremists on both

left and right, were numerous. Xenophobia lies very near the surface of the public mind. In time of full employment it obtains only negligible expression, but a change in the economic climate might create a clamour on this issue. Here another historic battleground might well have to be the scene of fresh battles. On the fundamental issue of human liberty English Nonconformity must not yield to pressure from ill-informed opinion at home or from allies abroad.

The first half of the twentieth century has witnessed a deterioration in the world position of principles for which Nonconformity stood in England. At the dawning of this century the battle for civil and religious liberty was assumed to have been won and the victory was confidently expected to be extended over the whole world. Since then great tracts of the earth have been subjugated by the most loathsome authoritarian regimes. Germany, Italy, Russia with its satellite States, and China have been held in civil and spiritual bondage. What was believed to be the invincible march of the ranks of freedom has been halted and in too many cases a retreat has taken place. If for the moment it may seem that the danger of further retirement is lessened the ground already lost is serious in its extent and location. The dictatorships lowered the esteem for the individual human being—the common people of whom Abraham Lincoln said, “God must have loved them, for he made so many of them.”

James Russell Lowell truly summed up nonconformity's attitude in the words he put into the mouth of Miles Standish :

He had stiff knees, the Puritan
That were not good at bending ;
The homespun dignity of man
He thought was worth defending.

It was in defence of this that men holding our views founded New England ; others fought at Marston Moor, Naseby, Dunbar and Worcester ; two thousand clergy left their livings in 1662 ; for centuries men strove to repeal the Test and Corporation Acts and to gain access to the Universities without subscription to Articles of Faith in which they did not believe. Each of these is an assertion of “the homespun dignity of man” on which alone can a Christian democracy be based. In the debates of the victorious Parliamentary Army at Putney in 1647 this cardinal principle found expression in Rainborough's claim : “The poorest he that is in England hath a life to live as much as the greatest he.” This is but the practical application to citizenship of the saying of Jesus :

I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.

To seek, discuss and proclaim truth as we find it remains the supreme duty. These will, at some stages, involve resistance to authority of State or Church or the new scientific hierarchy when any of these attempts to impinge on conscience and individual freedom of expression and association. Such freedom of soul and mind was preserved two centuries ago in Dissenting churches and schools. Nonconformity, confronted with the difficulties of this new age has to resist boldly everything which would, if unchallenged, detract from the way of life which has been ours since the days of Wycliffe. The cause of right has never been respectable. Its advocates and protectors have been crucified, derided and contemned.

They are slaves who will not choose
Hatred, scoffing, and abuse,
Rather than in silence shrink
From the truth they needs must think ;
They are slaves who dare not be
In the right with two or three.

Only by such heroic witness can 'life more abundantly' be achieved. The descendants of the persecutors have acclaimed those who in the evil day stood fast for the things of the spirit. Our generation cannot escape the test which throughout the ages men have had to face. To us, as much as to the early Christians, was written the last chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians :

But he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting. And let us not be weary in well doing : for in due season we shall reap, *if we faint not.*

THE REVIVAL OF DOGMATISM

By JOHN S. YEARSLEY, M.A.

A REMARKABLE feature of religion during the last twenty-five or thirty years—perhaps its most remarkable feature—is the interest that has arisen among Protestants in the idea of the Church. For, indeed, it is by no means an isolated or restricted phenomenon: we may clearly observe its growth in all the historic Protestant communions, even where evangelicalism is most pronounced. In Methodism, for example, we find the idea exerting a considerable influence; and, most surprising of all, perhaps, within churches of the Congregational order. Moreover, it is not confined to any particular country or region. The International Missionary Conferences that have taken place in recent years, the Union of the Churches of South India, and the interest now displayed in the World Council of Churches, together with the themes discussed in its conferences, provide sufficient evidence that the phenomenon is world-wide.

It may be recalled, however, that, before the present development began to take place, at all events, it was characteristic of Protestants to regard the Church simply as a voluntary association of individual Christian believers for certain specific purposes: in particular, for the worship of God and the nurture of their own faith, and for the winning to the Faith of those outside it; and it is perhaps worth noting that W. L. Sperry attributes this view of it to American Protestants.¹ Our forbears would have been profoundly shocked, for example, by the opinion, now sometimes heard in Protestant circles, that “there is no salvation outside the Church.” While allowing that the Church has an evangelistic function, salvation itself, they would have claimed, is a strictly individual affair. It should occasion no surprise, therefore, if perhaps there are those who have serious misgivings about the new development; and who may even feel that a ‘palace revolution’ is taking place, and that the very foundations of Protestantism are being shaken from within.

But there are many, on the other hand, for whom the movement has a considerable attraction. It may be due in part to pragmatic considerations, to the possible value of the new emphasis in gaining members for the Church, and in maintaining their loyalty to it. A deeper reason, however, must also be recognised. This contemporary emphasis upon

¹*Religion in America*, p. 182.

the Church seems to correspond to an important discovery we have been led to make, in recent years, in our reading of the New Testament; and which, we feel, was not adequately provided for within historic Protestantism. There may be much truth here; more especially, our Protestant forbears, in the light of our discovery, were probably far too individualistic in their interpretation of St. Paul's doctrine of Justification by Faith. Nevertheless, we must not too readily assume that they missed entirely that other aspect of primitive Christianity. We should be careful, in other words, to observe that what we now find in the New Testament as essential to Christianity is *koinonia*—the fellowship or community of the Spirit; and, though it may only seem a short step from the community of the Spirit to the Church, it may actually be a false step, since the one does not necessarily involve the other.

The important fact, however, to be faced is that, in the religious atmosphere of our time, so largely conditioned by ecumenicalism and by movements towards intercommunion and union between Churches, this emphasis upon the idea of the Church is likely to increase rather than decrease. It is, therefore, opportune that we reflect carefully upon what is happening, and that we consider the possible dangers involved. For can we doubt, in the light of history, that there are dangers—that we are on treacherous ground here, and that we need to tread cautiously?

Two things happened at the Reformation: the inner life of the Spirit was set at liberty, and the bonds of ecclesiastical authority were broken. But the main significance of this for us is that they happened together. There was nothing accidental, that is to say, in what the Reformation achieved; there was rather a necessary connection between the two aspects of it. As witness, we may point to the fact that, during the Middle Ages, the Church kept a ceaseless watch over the inner and mystical, the evangelical, experience, as she did also over the exploration of the physical world. There is no disputing the testimony of history here; and she did it, of course, because she feared that if men came into close and immediate contact with spiritual reality, they would violate her sanctions; just as she also suspected that such knowledge of the spiritual world, no less than knowledge of nature, would be far-reaching in its repercussions within theology.

In view of subsequent events, we can hardly say that the medieval Church was mistaken in her insight. What, then, we have now clearly to be on our guard against is a reversal of the process. That does not mean that it must happen inevitably; it is merely to say that it could happen. In

religion there is always a constant tension, which at any moment may break into conflict, between the inner authority of the Spirit and the external authority of creeds and ecclesiastical regulations ; and, while the conflict went one way at the time of the Reformation, with a re-emphasis on the idea of the Church, it might well go the other way.

Whenever, in the past, the Church has had the power to enforce her rule, she has never shown any hesitation in using it. Professor Herbert Butterfield has made this perfectly clear : " To me," he says, " one of the terrible things in history—an issue which I cannot be satisfied to evade—is the fact that the Christian Church began a cruel policy of persecution from the earliest moment when it was in a position (and had the power) to do so ; while at the other end of the story both Catholic and Protestant Churches fought to the last point of cruelty not merely to maintain their persecuting power—but fought a separate war for each separate weapon of persecution that was being taken from them."² It would perhaps appear somewhat fanciful, under the conditions prevailing in the modern world, even to hint at the return of such a situation. As Professor Butterfield also points out,³ the Church is now back again, after fifteen hundred years, in much the same position as that to which it was accustomed in the earliest Christian centuries. The old alliance between the Church and the secular powers is practically at an end ; and who can envisage its revival ? Yet we must not forget that we live in a revolutionary age—an age in which anything might happen. We cannot, therefore, exclude even this possibility entirely. Indeed, signs are not lacking that Temporal Power is still not completely neutral in its attitude to Spiritual Power ; and that the contending forces in the present struggle might well be interested ultimately in coming to terms with a Church sufficiently accommodating and 'safe.' A universal Church in a totalitarian world, if such should be the shape of things to come, could be a prospect not at all pleasant to contemplate.

But what should be our more immediate concern is the first and the essential step towards such an end ; and this surely is none other than the recognition of an enforceable norm, some rigid law of faith and practice—since there can only be enforcement when there is something to enforce. There is a potential danger to spiritual freedom in any fixed dogma: but especially whenever there emerges a comprehensive and clearly articulated orthodoxy. It is this that provides the context in which violence may operate, if the opportunity to

²*Christianity and History*, p. 132.

³*op. cit.*, p. 135.

exercise it ever arises. But, quite apart from its association with such extreme sanctions, a fixed orthodoxy is always in some measure coercive ; with the prestige of the Church alone behind it, it may either induce an undesirable submission on the part of the individual, or drive him, in mental and spiritual distress, from the fold. It is surely significant that, while the term 'heresy' is now never heard among Protestants, at least in this country, it is still in common currency among Catholics, both Roman and Anglican.

Now is it not at this point, in particular, that we need to watch the new Protestant interest in the Church ? Is it not here that the Reformation may well be thrown away ? If there is any inclination to feel that the danger is imaginary and to turn the suggestion of it aside as purely alarmist, it might be advisable, first of all, to look once again at the fact that, close on the heels of the new emphasis on the Church, there has also appeared a new emphasis upon the historic creeds, and upon what is described as Biblical theology. I mention the two together, since scholarship shows increasingly that they are not as distinct from one another as may sometimes be imagined. Moreover, there can be little doubt that the creeds are basic to the whole movement, and supply the norm in determining what shall be regarded as Biblical teaching ; and there are also other grounds upon which this Biblical theology may be suspected of a certain unreality. Is it legitimate to treat the Bible as a theological text-book ? A former generation of scholars and theologians, at all events, strenuously denied it ; they offered it to us, rather, as a record of religious experience, and I know of nothing that has happened in the meantime to justify a change of view. It would seem then misleading to suggest that there is one single line of theological development in the Bible. It is perhaps nearer the truth to say that we find there a variety of speculative hints and excursions, some of which are pursued further than others, and, therefore, appear more dominant ; but with the qualification—and this is, perhaps, particularly true of the New Testament—that an orthodoxy is seen intruding itself here and there from the environment in which the literature took its shape. Thus, it is reasonably clear that the prevailing trend in contemporary theology, in both its aspects, is a dogmatic trend ; and is it not significant that it follows so closely upon an awakened interest in the Church ? Can the conjunction of events be a mere accident ? Is it not far more probable that there is a close and even necessary connection between them ?

There are those, let us observe, who profess to find in this

movement back to tradition, in this neo-orthodoxy, a resurgence of Protestantism : of a Protestantism, they say, that is Catholic and Apostolic, strongly ecclesiastical and sacramental, as it was in the beginning. It may be questioned whether quite so much can be fairly claimed without qualification, so far as original Protestantism is concerned ; but, even granting this, surely we have here a distorting emphasis on what was negative and formal, which conceals what was positive and essential. Thus, it was one thing when Luther, in the very act of defying the authority of the Church, and when it was necessary for him to do so, in order to secure citizen rights within the Empire, and to substantiate his claim to belong to Christendom that lay outside the jurisdiction of the Pope—it was one thing when he said that he accepted the creeds as a basis of faith ; it is quite another thing when the contemporary movement re-emphasizes them in the present context. They would seem to be moving in precisely opposite directions. Such special pleading, therefore, does nothing to allay our suspicions that something is afoot which puts the Reformation in danger, but tends rather to increase them.

Indeed, there are signs in the movement, especially among continental Protestant theologians, though not exclusively, not only of a threat to the Reformation, but also of our being required eventually to give up the Renaissance. What amazing naiveté Professor Cullmann,⁴ for example, appears to expect of us ! Primitive Christianity, he argues, conceived consistently of time as a continuous straight line, running from Creation, through the Christ event and on, beyond the Parousia, into the new Creation ; a conception it took over, with the appropriate modifications, directly from the Old Testament. This naive doctrine, he claims, is central to the Christian proclamation of a redemptive history (redemption in time) ; it is integral to the Gospel and the 'scandal' of it. Professor Cullmann's interpretation of the New Testament message may be questioned. One wonders, for example, whether he has taken the Fourth Gospel sufficiently into account ; and, in particular, Professor C. H. Dodd's important work upon it, and the mass of new evidence he offers in further support of the view that there are definite signs of strong Platonic influence here.⁵ There is also the wider consideration of the impact of Greek thought in general on primitive Christian speculation as a whole. Surely, taking place in an environment whose religious atmosphere, as Professor Dodd shows,⁶ was permeated by the Greek mentality, it could hardly

⁴*Christ and Time*, Oscar Cullmann.

⁵*The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*.

⁶*op. cit.*

have escaped its impact. But the surprising thing about Professor Cullmann is that he seems quite prepared, on purely dogmatic grounds, to relinquish our own cultural heritage for one that is completely foreign to us and unreal. It may be granted that, so far as I know, he is an extreme case ; but it serves to warn us of the degree of cultural isolation into which Christianity may be led by this neo-orthodoxy. A very different case is that of Professor Rudolph Bultmann, who makes large concessions to liberalism and the modern mind. But is it not again significant that, in spite of this, he frowns severely upon any attempt to get behind the Apostolic witness ? It is surely some indication of the strength of the prevailing dogmatic trend ; of how extremely difficult it is even now to remain uninfluenced by it.

There is, then, already sufficient evidence that, in seeking to give adequate recognition to the doctrine of the Church, we may be found once again firmly treading the path of dogmatism ; and, as we have seen, it is a threat to our Protestant heritage—to the freedom of the Spirit, and, in fact, also to its ethical emphasis, particularly upon the peculiarly Christian virtues, the gentle virtues—together with its cultural background. But should we not also be anxious to avoid it for the further reason, that it is a denial of the Church itself ? It is upon this rock that the Church has been shattered once. Would it not happen again ? Would it not inevitably happen ?

The Church, in its true nature, as Dr. C. E. Raven has so well said,⁷ is not an organization, but an organism. Indeed, the New Testament writers were saying much the same thing when they described the Church as the “ Body of Christ ” and found its being in *koinonia*. But perhaps, today, we can appreciate, as those who belonged to the ancient and mediaeval worlds could not, that this means that it has a particular sort of unity. To say that the Church is an ‘organism’ implies that its unity is organic ; an internal and inherent unity, not a unity imposed upon it. When the New Testament speaks of the “ Body of Christ ” and of *koinonia*, it may mean more than that, but it does not mean less. Actually, of course, for the New Testament, the bond that binds the Church together is the indwelling Spirit ; it is the “ communion of the Holy Ghost ” ; but its unity is still organic, inherent unity.

It is clear, therefore, that, as an organism, as an organic whole, the Church, as Dr. Raven points out, cannot be an organization. As an organization, its unity would be of the other sort, the sort that is imposed from without, and which is not inherent ; a unity, in other words, not of the Spirit, but

⁷*The Gospel and the Church*, Hodder & Stoughton, 1939.

of objective, external law. This is not to argue that it can do without organization and law; rules of faith and practice. The true nature of the Church is *koinonia*, to which belongs organic unity; in fact, only as it is so may we be said to find our salvation within it. But, in this sense, as we may call the New Testament itself to witness, it is always in process of becoming; and so long as this is true, so long as its inherent unity remains imperfect and incomplete, a degree of organization will be needed to maintain it. What we should be most careful to recognise, however, is that the unity of law and organization is no more than a substitute for the reality, which is always the inherent unity of the Spirit. The organization of the Church, therefore, with its rules of faith and practice, should be kept strictly within minimal limits; and it should never be a negation of true unity.

Now it is surely evident, without dwelling in detail upon the unhappy history of the Church, that, in the past, there was failure in both these respects, and especially in the latter. In a familiar passage, which would appear to possess the authentic ring, Jesus says: "Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and their great ones exercise authority upon them. But so shall it not be among you: but whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister: and whosoever of you will be chiefest, shall be servant of all."⁸ Can there be any doubt that the rule of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, after Constantine at all events, followed the pattern of that same secular authority Jesus had in mind? But, as the passage implies, this "Gentile lordship," and the new social relationship Jesus came to inaugurate (*koinonia*), are mutually exclusive—the former being coercive and the latter persuasive. Thus, not only was there an atrophy of true unity under the weight of an oppressive organization, but also two principles were in conflict. The Church, that is to say, developed an organization which destroyed her organic structure and rendered her inorganic; she sacrificed the substance for the shadow, and so strife and division arose.

How, then, may we now escape such a compulsive dogmatism as might well by-pass the Reformation and lead to a repetition of the tragedy of the past, while, at the same time, giving adequate recognition to the Church? Dogmatism, as we have seen, is by no means essential to the idea of the Church; on the contrary, it is the denial of it. A dogmatic Church, in other words, offers not the least guarantee of the *koinonia* of the New Testament, as a corrective of the

⁸Mark x, 42-44.

individualism of historic Protestantism—it is instructive in fact to observe that the individualistic conception of salvation was equally characteristic of the mediaeval Church.

The crux of the matter perhaps is our conception of tradition, though it is here that the prevailing neo-orthodoxy gives most cause for alarm. There is no doubt of the importance of tradition ; and we should, indeed, reverence it. But we should be clear that what we have here is a treasure in an earthen vessel, and that it is worthy of our reverence because of the treasure it bears, and for no other reason. If we are to remain true to the conviction that at the centre of our Faith there lies a Divine revelation in the *Person* of Jesus Christ, we must surely make the distinction ; and, further, unless we do, reverence becomes idolatry. Indeed, a distinction is sometimes made between tradition and Scripture ; and it appears to have a long history behind it, going back to the time in which the New Testament canon was formed.⁹ But it is clearly somewhat arbitrary and unreal ; it must always have been so, since who could decide where to draw the line between the two ; and, in the light of the historical study of the canon, it becomes so increasingly. The real distinction, therefore, is not between Scripture and tradition, but between Gospel and tradition : between the 'treasure' and the 'earthen vessel' that contains it. Now this is the idea of tradition that, for example, has been admirably expounded by Dr. James Moffatt,¹⁰ and which, I think, may truly be described as the distinctive Protestant conception of it. Because of the very nature of what lies at the heart of tradition—the Divine revelation in Jesus Christ—tradition can never be a dead thing, a mummy, handed on intact from the distant past. It is rather a living and creative thing—something for which each succeeding generation holds a responsibility, and to which it must make its contribution ; something that each generation must become part of and make its own ; something that must breathe again, with new life, in every generation. If this idea can prevail, we need never fear that we shall be overwhelmed by dogmatism. But it has never been popular among those who belong to what is claimed to be the Catholic position ; indeed, even among Protestants, the idea has had a somewhat chequered history, and today it would seem far from secure. The conception thrives in a situation that is spiritually alive and vigorous, and when men have no alarms for the Faith. But in a time such as this, when even Protestant theologians can tell us that no new idea is now possible, that every alternative

⁹*Christ and Time*, Oscar Cullman, pp. 170-171.

¹⁰*The Thrill of Tradition*.

has been explored and sifted, and the best of them have found their way into the creeds—in other words, when they proscribe creative thought within the Faith, much as, at an earlier stage, the Jewish scribes proclaimed a cessation of prophecy—we may well begin to tremble.

The truth is that, lying behind the Protestant conception of tradition, there is the modern (empirical) mentality, with its roots deep in Greek culture ; and the one depends upon the other. Let it be frankly admitted that the tension between the Christian Faith and the modern mind to-day is acute and embarrassing ; but we must not regard it as a sufficient excuse for attempting to separate them. Christianity is essentially incarnational : it is no mere celestial stranger here—it was ‘born’ into our world, and irrevocably it is identified with it. If it were to withdraw into the isolation of some untouchable Mount Sinai, it would wither away and die. Its link, therefore, with advancing culture must unquestionably be maintained, and the way of reconciliation must be pursued relentlessly until again we find it.

But, in any case, if those tendencies within contemporary theology towards the rejection of our cultural inheritance are not checked, we are threatened with an obscurantism that would impose impossible restrictions upon the life of the Spirit in this age of science ; and that would also reduce to vanity all our hopes of the Church, as a living, dynamic, organic unity, as the true Body of Christ.

MODERNISM AND CONGREGATIONALISM

By EDWARD S. KIEK, M.A., D.D.

A STRICT definition of 'Modernism' is hardly possible. No two 'modernists' are likely to define it in the same way. Being impatient, not to say resentful, of creeds, they are unwilling as well as unable to agree on any creed of their own. Thus Modernism is a somewhat inchoate thing, difficult either to attack or defend. Perhaps it should be called an attitude or point of view, based on the general proposition that the Christian Faith may and should adjust itself, or be adjusted, to what is comprehensively described as 'modern knowledge.'

The name itself is to many people rather irritating, though for others it possesses a certain allurements. It might appear, on the face of it, to suggest an uncritical disparagement of ancient tradition and an equally uncritical acceptance of notions claiming to be modern. This, however, may be unfair: the more thoughtful modernists would utterly disclaim it. Yet the unfortunate impression above indicated is apt to be encouraged by the belligerent attitude of some 'left-wing' modernists, who appear to regard other Christians as either held in the bondage of out-of-date traditionalism or as compromising the interests of truth in the effort to promote some degree of reconciliation between opposing points of view.

Leaving this matter of nomenclature, let us face the much more important question of adjustment. How far should we go in attempting to relate the Christian Faith to modern knowledge? Both terms need definition: to expound the content of either of them would be a large and controversial undertaking. For our present purpose we can only assume that most readers will have at least a general idea of what is meant.

No religion can be unaffected by the environment in which it lives and works: Church History provides ample illustration of this truth. At the outset Christianity shows clear evidence of the influence of Jewish Messianism and apocalypticism, which is not to say that it is merely a product of such influences. When Christianity moved into the Gentile world, it naturally adjusted itself to the basic ideas of Greek culture, as later to those of Roman imperialism, mediaeval feudalism, 18th century rationalism, 19th century individualism and the 20th century 'social conscience.' Yet the special genius of Christianity itself enabled it to maintain a recognizable continuity

through all these successive adventures in adjustment. This process of adjustment is, within limits, justifiable and indeed inevitable. Missionaries in every generation are the children of their own age as well as mediators of the Christian tradition. They must needs relate their message to the presuppositions and thought-background of their own contemporaries and speak in a language understood by their audiences. Even if the content of the evangelical message be regarded as immutable, the form of it is naturally and necessarily subject to alteration.

These observations are particularly relevant to periods when the climate of opinion suffers profound modification and words themselves gain new meanings. Such periods are marked by re-interpretations of the Gospel to meet the needs of a new age. If no adjustment is effected or the adjustment is unduly delayed, traditional forms of belief are apt to seem antiquated, irrelevant and even unintelligible to many of those whom the Church seeks to reach. That such a situation exists today is surely beyond dispute.

At such periods, even when ancient creeds and confessions are rigidly maintained, changes occur in their interpretation. They are always 'symbolic' in form, as all religious thinking must be. It is even possible that re-interpretation may occur without people being fully conscious of it. Another point to bear in mind is that educated and enlightened people will often interpret in a more or less allegorical sense creeds and confessions which others still interpret with crude literalism. All may say the same things, but with very great differences of meaning. We see this happening today in all denominations which have fixed standards. Even in the World Council of Churches, the basis of membership—acceptance of Jesus Christ as 'God and Saviour'—is interpreted in widely different ways by different member Churches. Yet any premature attempt to re-word the basis, unsatisfactory as we may think it to be, might easily wreck the Council and is therefore to be deprecated.

How far this process of adjustment may legitimately go is, of course, a major issue. That it may go so far as to involve the total subversion of the historic Faith is undeniable. Second century Gnosticism was firmly rejected on this account: it annihilated the historical foundations of Christianity and sought to turn it into a speculative theosophy. Arianism, which propounded a Christ neither truly God nor perfectly man, but a kind of demi-god, was likewise rejected. The controversy was not, as some foolish people make out, 'a quarrel about a diphthong,' but a battle against a heresy

whose very popularity was due to its affinity with essentially pagan ideas. We know how, in the early 18th century, under the prevalent influence of a somewhat arid rationalism, many 'non-subscribing' dissenting churches drifted first into Arianism, then into Socinianism and then into Unitarianism. In the United States many Unitarian Churches have drifted into Humanism. Here in Australia one of the very few Unitarian Churches has drifted into something like Communism and ceased to have any religious character at all.

Yet it must be acknowledged that the existence of formally recognized creeds or 'standards' is no guarantee against what are called 'modernistic' tendencies, as is evident to anyone familiar with Anglicanism, Presbyterianism and Methodism. Even in such rigidly dogmatic Churches as the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran there is probably much crypto-Modernism. No pressure of ecclesiastical discipline can prevent intelligent people from thinking for themselves or insulate them from the currents of thought that flow around them. No living religion can be altogether static.

In view of the historic facts just cited, it is not surprising that many devout Christians, including some Congregationalists, distrust and dislike anything which looks like concession to the so-called modernists. Their attitude is somewhat like that of Charles Haddon Spurgeon in the famous 'Down-Grade' controversy. They fear that any weakening of traditionalism may open the door to a disintegrating process which will end in the total subversion of "the faith once for all delivered to the saints." In fairness to them, it must be said that their supreme concern is for the maintenance of Christianity as a religion of redemption. For this very reason they ought to be treated with the utmost consideration compatible with maintaining that freedom of interpretation so justly prized by us Congregationalists.

Here it may be worth pointing out to these anxious people that the disintegrating process which so deplorably affected early 18th century Dissent was far less evident in the Independent Churches than in the Presbyterian. The Independents, with few exceptions, remained loyal to the evangelical tradition handed down from the patriarchs of 16th and 17th century Independency. In the 19th century this statement still held good, though Congregationalism gradually emancipated itself from the rigidities of the Calvinist theology. It was a time of much theological disturbance. Naturally there were serious differences among Congregationalists: there were some regrettable manifestations of 'orthodox' bigotry, as in the attacks launched against that gentle and sensitive soul, T. T. Lynch.

Yet, on the whole, Congregationalists proved creditably accessible to new light and truth. Broadly speaking, 19th century Congregationalism, especially as represented by such men as R. W. Dale, R. F. Horton, C. Silvester Horne, J. D. Jones, A. M. Fairbairn and P. T. Forsyth, showed that acceptance of a new approach to the Bible was fully compatible with adherence to the essential principles of Reformed and Evangelical theology. A few men, indeed, developed extremely radical views, like those who became protagonists of the absurd 'Christ-Myth' theory, but these had no influence on the main stream of Congregational life and thought. Thus it was proved, once for all, that our Congregational freedom, though involving us in differences of outlook and judgment, not to say real tensions, is conditioned by something in the ethos of our Churches which sets a limit on aberrations which might land us in sheer anarchy.

In urging adjustment to 'modern knowledge,' Modernists are probably thinking, in the first place, of those vast and varied areas of research covered by the proliferating branches of natural science. The progress here achieved has transformed our entire conception of the cosmos, including the nature of matter itself, thrown a flood of light on the antiquity and evolution of man and, most impressive of all, has revolutionized the conditions of our daily life and work. What must the spirit of John Owen think, if he can see me in a study, in a land he never heard of, with a neon light, a pleasant gas-fire and a modern typewriter, surrounded by books on themes altogether outside his earthly purview? Certain it is that many who were incapable of following learned discussions in what to them was an unknown tongue, were so hypnotized by the spectacular achievements of modern discovery that they were, at least in the period before the invention of the atomic bomb, disposed to hail Science as the New Messiah and to reject anything alleged to be at variance with its pronouncements.

No one would think of denying that mid-20th century science represents an immeasurable advance on, say, the science of Aristotle. Our knowledge of the universe, however imperfect, is incomparably greater than that of Paul, Augustine and Aquinas. Few, however, would contend that our progress in moral insight and everyday behaviour is in any way parallel to the progress of the natural sciences. Here indeed is the major problem confronting mankind at this hour. In the realm of economic and international relationships we live, for the most part, on a sub-Christian level. As things are, the innumerable applications of our enlarged knowledge

are undisciplined and unrestrained by any general recognition of Christian ideals and sanctions. Thus, while we are faced with the necessity of re-thinking our theology in the light of all these changes, the world is menaced with destruction because Christian ethics shares in the confusion of Christian theology. One sign of this is the endless controversy about pacifism.

The scientific method has been applied to the study of the Scriptures, as is strikingly illustrated in the rigid objectivity of textual criticism. Literary and historical criticism, being less highly specialized and more closely related to the great issue of authority and inspiration, awakens wider interest. That a large harvest of agreed results has been reaped in this extensive and much-tilled field must be thankfully acknowledged by anyone familiar with it. Not always have these results been unfavourable to traditional views. Yet many traditional views have had to be abandoned or amended by all whose minds are accessible to evidence. Equally is it true that many modern theories have been similarly discredited by subsequent research. In this, as in other sciences, progress is by way of trial and error.

One fact stands out clearly. The theory of verbal inspiration, derived from the Jewish rabbis and uncompromisingly re-stated by the Protestant scholastics of the 17th century, has long ceased to be tenable. To mention nothing else, it cannot survive any objective study of the Gospels in parallel columns. It is indeed exceedingly fortunate that the universal Church has never committed itself to any dogmatic pronouncement on the nature and extent of Bible inspiration any more than it has to any particular theory of the Atonement.¹ Far more disturbing for most people is the fact that the entire biblical conception of the cosmos has been rendered antiquated by the new astronomy which dates from the age of the Renaissance, despite the vehement opposition of the Roman Curia and the refusal of Luther and Calvin to take any account of it. No longer can we think of a three-compartment universe, with seven heavens above the starry firmament and Sheol located somewhere in "the lower parts of the earth." Thus the Ascension story, to mention nothing else, has become very difficult. Einstein's relativities cannot be adjusted to those of the biblical writers. Nor can we think of disease, mental and physical, still less of storms and similar phenomena, as originated by the malign activity of a host of demons, under the general supervision of "the prince of the power of the air,"

¹"The Independent Press" has published a fascinating book on this subject—*Evangelical Nonconformists and Higher Criticism in the 19th Century*—by WILLIS B. GLOVER, JR.

who is also "the prince of this world." War, famine and pestilence, for countless ages regarded as divine judgments on sinful men, can no longer be so regarded, at least in the sense formerly understood. Such a text as "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," which furnished supposedly divine authority for one of the most ghastly persecutions in history, now excites no reaction but a smile, though English, Scottish and American Puritans took it with the utmost seriousness, as was done also by such a commonsense person as John Wesley.

Most people have now realized that many phases of Old Testament ethics are transcended in Christ, as He himself specifically declared. Now it is borne upon us that some phases of New Testament ethics have ceased to possess authority. Few among us would endorse the Pauline teaching about marriage and celibacy, as set forth in *I Corinthians* vii. Nor do we endorse the Pauline teaching about the exclusion of women from the public ministry of the Churches (*I Corinthians* xiv, 34; *I Timothy* ii, 12): the election of a distinguished woman-minister to the Chair of the Congregational Union of England and Wales is dramatic evidence of this. Nor is New Testament theology unaffected by the changed outlook. Even when attractively paraphrased by J. B. Phillips in *Letters to Young Churches*, the presuppositions and arguments of Paul are often entirely foreign to our ways of thought, as is also the ingenious typology of the *Epistle to the Hebrews*. The delineation of the Warrior Christ in the Apocalypse of St. John is strange and even repugnant to very many of us. The plain truth is that the Biblical outlook is everywhere pre-scientific and again and again shows the influence of a thought-world which we have outgrown. The custom of prefacing all Scripture readings with such a formula as "Hear the Word of God as it is contained in . . ." is therefore open to grave objection, inasmuch as it at least suggests that we hold to a view of Scripture which we have, in fact, long since abandoned.

The question of miracle is much too vast to be adequately discussed merely by way of illustration. Much turns on the debated issue of how 'miracle' is to be defined. Some alleged miracles, declared incredible by 19th century rationalists, are now widely accepted as being quite in line with recent research on the mystery of the Mind-Body relationship. The mighty power of faith has been again and again empirically demonstrated, even in other than a Christian context. Less than ever does it seem reasonable to set *a priori* limits to the possibilities of an altogether unique and utterly consecrated personality. Above all, the Resurrection of our Lord, despite undeniable discrepancies in the documentary evidence, seems

less difficult to accept than are any of the numerous and conflicting theories advanced by those who challenge its historicity. The whole discussion is seen in a new light when set in the total context of Christian faith and experience. All this does not mean that we are committed to the acceptance of every recorded miracle in the Bible story. In some instances we may find the evidence inadequate or some alternative explanation more than plausible. Every instance ought to be examined on its merits, without partiality or prejudice. Always we must bear in mind that the claims of Christ are not justly founded on any miracles that He wrought, any more than they are on His alleged fulfilment of obscure Old Testament prophecies. Miracles cannot authenticate Him, though He may authenticate them. Even the Resurrection would have no significance for us, if it had not been Christ who was raised.

Surely there is nothing in this line of thought at variance with the scientific approach to reality. Scientists are naturally and properly concerned only with normal sequences of cause and effect. In the present context we are dealing with situations and phenomena which Christian faith affirms to be, in the highest degree, super-normal. Nor can we forget that the most recent science has disclosed as actual and operative all kinds of potentialities whose very existence was unknown to the science of an earlier time. The dogmatism of an out-of-date rationalism is no less open to criticism than that of an out-of-date theology.

Transcending all these controversies is the fact that Christ is still known to 'the Beloved Community' as "the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth." Our own experience, verified by the entire history of the Church in every land and age, bears witness that He does for us what only God can do. That "God was in Christ, reconciling the world to Himself" is not a dogmatic assertion concerning things beyond our ken, though it does imply a mystery far exceeding our powers of rationalization. If it be sadly true that in us and in our fellowships He exhibits much less than the full splendour of His healing and regenerative work, we know all too well that this tragedy is the inevitable consequence of the feebleness of our own faith. A. G. Hogg stressed this point long ago in *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*. It is still acutely relevant to our need and distress.

The Modernist stress on the full reality of our Lord's human character, and even on His human limitations, is, of course, amply borne out by the evidence of the Gospels: it is also, as it happens, quite 'orthodox.' The Fourth Gospel and

the Johannine Epistles prove that a most exalted estimate of the Person of Christ is quite consistent with a vehement rejection of Docetism. The ancient creeds declare Him "perfectly Man," even though the full implications of this confession have often been minimized or obscured. Yet history bears abundant witness that the *communis sensus fidelium* has never been content with a simply humanist interpretation of Christ. He is Lord as well as Leader, Saviour as well as Exemplar. These loftier designations do more than acknowledge His uniqueness: they assign to Him a transcendent status, character and mission: they declare Him worthy of our worship as well as entitled to our uttermost obedience. What He has meant and still means to us makes it morally as well as intellectually impossible to think less or to say less. If the famous "Chalcedonian Definition of the Faith," admittedly couched in the language of a bygone time, is judged by us to be unsatisfactory, this is not because what it is trying to say is untrue, but because the whole truth is bound to elude any attempt at human definition.

Modernists are surely right in calling us to face all these issues in a spirit of utmost candour. The new light which modern science has thrown on the constitution of the universe and the new light which modern criticism has thrown on the Bible are part of that progressive unfolding of truth which we can trace in the Bible itself. Since few of us can accept the notion of a 'double truth,' the necessity of readjustment is not merely apparent, but urgent. Yet our major concern can never be with critical discussions and speculative theories. The Christian religion is more than a system of theology or a code of morals or a blue-print of social reconstruction. It always has been and always will be the Gospel of the Blessed God, offering to all mankind not merely the promise but the power of new life in Christ. To use current jargon, it deals with existential issues in an existential way. Ardent protagonists on both sides of this controversy want to force us into an either-or situation. Is it not wiser and better to recognize in both these seemingly opposed standpoints a genuine concern for values which all thoughtful Christians should count sacred and dear? Welcoming new light, from whatever source it may come, as John Robinson bade us to do, we must still hold fast to the revelation and the experience which constrained Peter to cry, Thou art the Christ, and Thomas to cry, My Lord and my God.

A QUESTION OF TEMPERAMENT

By THOMAS MCPHERSON, M.A., B.PHIL.

THERE are plenty of real and bad-tempered quarrels which would never have broken out if the parties to them had been clearer about the implications of their own and their opponents' positions. This is the case with the celebrated 'conflict between science and religion.' While it lasted (and to some extent it continues even today) this conflict owed its existence to mistaken ideas held by both sides.

Some scientists have objected to the 'obscurantism' of religion. 'Obscurantism' is a hard word for something that can be named more kindly. There is nothing necessarily wrong in seeing things in the light of long-held fixed ideas. The scientist himself does this. To stick to your own kind of explanation of things is as much a scientific as a religious trait. We grow used to organizing facts in a certain way, so that if we do not organize them in that way they do not appear to us to be organized at all.

But this general charge of obscurantism is not the only, or the most important, form that has been taken by the scientific attack on religion. (The attack has, indeed, not always come from scientists but often from anti-religious people who, not being scientists themselves, have nevertheless thought it useful, the prestige of 'Science' (with a capital 'S') being what it is, to shelter behind the protection of the magic words, "Science has shown . . ." But it is usual, and convenient, to speak of the conflict as one between science and religion, and this I shall do.)

In the time of our grandfathers, and until recent years, biology, physics, and psychology (more or less in that order) have been regarded by some sincere but muddle-headed scientists, and by some sincere but muddle-headed devout persons, as the enemies of religion. The great Evolution bogey of the biologists; the attack on miracles, coming chiefly from the physical scientist; the discrediting of religion by the showing up of its trivial or unsavoury psychological origins—these things, each in its turn, have given the religious mind a jolt. The conflict is over and, in effect, the scientist has won. The religious position has gradually been accommodated to the scientific.

Yet to say that the conflict is over and that the scientist has won is to imply that the conflict was justified and the victory therefore real. In fact, the conflict, though each side

fought hard enough, was so much waste of effort, and there was no real victory to be won by anybody.

This is familiar ground, but I do not think one can go too often over well-known and important controversies. There are always new insights to be caught, new possibilities of making the old errors to be avoided. Let us then rehearse—briefly and in the simplest terms—the conflict between science and religion.

The Darwin-Wallace Theory of Evolution did not seem to many Christians to be easily reconcilable with the opening passages of *Genesis*. An important part of the Christian view of the relation between God and man seems entailed in the traditional view of creation. Man, we are told, is “made in the image of God.” What becomes of this if man is (crudely) “descended from monkeys”?

We are not concerned with what the Theory of Evolution does involve but rather with what it was thought to involve. The battle between the Creationists and the Evolutionists was bloody. There was going to extremes on both sides. But the Creationists were doomed to defeat. They were fighting not just a biological theory but the whole ‘spirit of the age.’ Evolutionary theory did not start with Darwin and Wallace. Darwin and Wallace did no more than apply in biology ideas that at least since Goethe and Hegel had been current in other spheres. The Creationists were fighting against the very idea of ‘progress’ so typical of their age—so typical of themselves, indeed, when they turned their minds to other things. And the evidence, both observational and experimental, was on the side of the Evolutionists.

In the end the Creationists capitulated. In books by modern liberal theologians the conflict is hardly any longer mentioned. It is simply assumed that the Evolutionary view is the right one and the Christian doctrine of creation is silently adjusted to it.

The attack on miracles was equally keenly resisted by the religious believer. “Science has shown that miracles are impossible,” was the form in which the attack came. “Miracles do not happen,” wrote Matthew Arnold, speaking for his time. “Nature works according to laws of regularity,” said the scientist; “suspension of those laws is inconceivable.” “But why?” asked the believer; “God made the laws and if He wants to, cannot God suspend the laws?”

The scientist, here again, was on stronger ground. Gradually the believer gave way. Liberal theologians began to offer, without argument, ‘explanations’ of the miracle stories of the Bible. Even the Resurrection itself was by many

‘explained.’ The picture is the same. Conflict : capitulation. Science wins, religion is adjusted.

More recently has come the attack from the psychologist. Not any particular aspect of religion (not the status of man in the universe, not miracles) is here under attack, but the whole of religion. Freudians, to take the best-known example, are prepared to account for religion in general—for religion as a human phenomenon. The account is not a simple one, and taken in all its aspects its completeness is staggering. Nothing seems to have been left out. Freud himself returned to the subject again and again. He has something to say about religion looked at from (it seems) every conceivable angle. And the impression left after his examination is of something much less important than the religious believer would claim it to be—the impression of an ‘illusion,’ which indeed *may* be true, but which there is no particular reason to think is true, and which there is every reason to think is only a projection of the unconscious wishes of the believer.

There has been a less complete capitulation to this attack. But there are not lacking religious believers who accept the general Freudian approach and who attempt a reconciliation with Freudian theory. And it is generally their Christianity rather than their Freudianism that makes the adjustments in the partnership.

This, then, is what has been meant by the conflict between science and religion. And I have stressed that on the whole science has come out of the conflict better than religion. Religion has, of course, gained something. The work of liberal theologians in interpreting Christian doctrine in the face of criticism based on scientific views has been in many ways admirable. Some dead wood that was threatening the growth of the Faith has been cut away. But the impression given to the world has been of Christianity in retreat—of the ‘obscurantists’ forced reluctantly to admit light into one corner after another of their dim and musty building.

There are still some things to be said about this threefold scientific attack on religion before we can squarely face the question whether there is any justification for the conflict.

Consider again the Evolution bogey. I have already pointed out that evolution was in the air of the nineteenth century. It was a principle according to which people were tending to organize their experience. It was a philosophical or metaphysical theory before it became a scientific theory. And—this is the point—it was frequently as a philosophical or metaphysical theory (though this was not always recognised) that it was invoked in the attack on religion.

The difference between a scientific and a metaphysical theory is (for our purposes) that the former is open to falsification whereas the latter is not. There is conceivable evidence which, if it were produced, should cause a scientific theory to be abandoned. But a metaphysical theory is not one that can be disproved by the production of evidence. It is a way of looking at things, a way of explaining things, that is not open to testing by empirical methods.

This is a grossly simplified account. There is metaphysics in science and science in metaphysics. But the broad difference exists and ought not to be lost sight of.

Now in so far as it is a scientific theory the Theory of Evolution is open to falsification. It cannot therefore ever be said to have been finally and conclusively 'proved,' and this is itself a point of some importance. But, even more important, in so far as it is put forward merely as a way of looking at things which gives the most attractive kind of explanation of how things behave, and which is not to be considered as open to empirical test, it is not a scientific theory at all but a metaphysical one. And, considered as a metaphysical theory, it is on a level with the older-fashioned religious world-picture. We may accept whichever appeals to us more. But it is dishonest to recommend the evolutionary picture *because* it is 'scientific.' Considered in the way it so often is it is doubtful whether it is entitled to the backing of the phrase 'a scientific theory.' (It is still scientific in the sense that it is bound up with an attitude to the world that lays great stress on scientific method and investigation and on their results, but in so far as it is put forward, though not by the best scientists, as 'proved' and not open to further question it is not scientific.)

Now let us turn again to the question of miracles. It is certainly my view that belief in miracles is not in general an essential part of the Faith. It is certainly wrong to base the Faith on miracles, as some have wanted to do. Belief in miracles, so far as we need it at all, must be based on the Faith, not the other way round. And it is doubtful whether we do need to believe in miracles. The Resurrection is admittedly a special case, and belief in a literal Resurrection may plausibly be held to be an indispensable part of Christianity. But it does not seem to me to matter greatly whether the other miracle stories reported in the New Testament are accepted or rejected.

In any case, and this is a more important point, the conflict between science and religion over this question of miracles seems to have arisen because of a mistaken notion of what a

miracle is. A miracle was thought by both scientist and believer at the height of the conflict to be an event involving the suspension of the laws of nature. The argument then discussed whether such suspensions ever did take place.

But this whole way of looking at things is absurd. Laws of nature are not like the laws of the land—not like, say, traffic regulations. They are not laws that can either be obeyed or broken. The notion of breaking a law of nature simply does not make sense. Laws of nature, so-called, are descriptions of how nature actually behaves. (They are *at least* this; but this is not intended as a complete account of what laws of nature are.) Whatever happens must be in accordance with some law of nature because whatever does actually happen could logically happen again and to make a generalised statement of such an event is to have expressed a law of nature.

The definition of a miracle as an event in which a law of nature is broken or suspended is, then, absurd. A much better definition is this: 'A miracle is an event which goes beyond our knowledge or expectation.' This definition will not altogether do, for it waters down the notion of miracle too much. There is no doubt that as the word is generally used in religious circles it is intended to stand for events that are fairly rare, whereas on this definition miracles happen every day. But the definition will do well enough here. The point that it makes is an important one. A miracle is best understood in relation not to what happens around us, but in relation to our comprehension of what happens around us. If something is sufficiently surprising and is otherwise of the sort that deserves the name we will call it a miracle. But this is only to say that we do not know the law of nature that covers it, not that there is no law of nature that covers it.

On this view of miracles, which seems to me essentially the right one, this particular part of the conflict between science and religion is seen to be unfounded.

The attack from psychology is particularly interesting. It helps to bring out clearly the importance of temperament in connexion with religion. There is no doubt that a certain type of person—a type to which belong, say, Kierkegaard and Simone Weil—tends to be associated with religion. They are people who do not gladly give themselves to others. They do not get on well with the opposite sex. It is when such people are in mind that the "religion is sublimated sex" view seems most plausible. There is indeed something like a typical religious temperament. In so far as the psychological attack has analyzed what this temperament consists in it has (though

perhaps unintentionally) done work of great service to religious thought.

But it is important to bear in mind—and here we approach more nearly the attack itself—that the Freudian view does not constitute, and, it seems, was not intended to constitute, a disproof of the validity of religion. The sense in which religion was said by Freud to be an ‘illusion’ is one in which “to be an illusion” does not entail “to be false.” Freud thought he could account for the origin of religious ideas in the individual, and his account is in many ways plausible. But to have suggested the origins of a thing is not (and—contrary to common opinion—Freud himself did not say definitely that it was) to have said anything that bears directly upon its truth. Coleridge’s *Kubla Khan* is neither a better nor a worse poem for its immediate origin in an opium dream. What holds of aesthetic value holds also of truth value. An individual’s belief in God may have its origins in the Oedipus Complex, or in the desire for a father-substitute, but this has no logical bearing on the question whether God in fact exists or not.

Now, finally, we leave this discussion of particular aspects of the ‘conflict between science and religion’ and turn to answer in more general terms the question whether such a conflict is justified.

There is a certain popularly held view of the relation between science and religion that we can call the ‘two realms view.’ This is the view that there is a ‘realm of science’ and a ‘realm of religion.’ These are two separate ‘realms.’ Sometimes they are referred to as ‘the realm of fact’ and ‘the realm of value.’ Because (so it is said) the realm of science and the realm of religion are utterly different there can be no *genuine* conflict between them.

Now we need not concern ourselves with the precise meaning of the not very clear phrases ‘realm of science’ and ‘realm of religion.’ What they mean does not matter. What does matter is that this view of the relation between science and religion can hardly be the right one for it is hard to see on this view how even the appearance of conflict between science and religion could have arisen.

The kind of picture a holder of the two realms view has in mind is of two people (the scientist and the religious man) standing back-to-back looking determinedly in opposite directions—one towards the realm of fact, the other towards the realm of value. But if two people are looking at different things there is neither, in fact, the possibility of genuine conflict between what each says when he describes what he sees,

nor the likelihood that they will deceive themselves into thinking that what they are saying is in conflict.

Surely a picture that comes nearer the truth is the picture of two people (the scientist and the religious man) standing side-by-side and looking at the same thing. What they see is the same but they have different ways of describing it. This is a 'one realm view.' And, indeed, the scientist and the religious man do inhabit the same, single world. They see it differently, but the difference is in their seeing rather than in what they see. One, looking at a daisy, may see it only as *Bellis perennis*; the other sees it as the marvellous work of God's hand.

The scientist and the religious man are not concerned with different things so much as with different aspects of the same things. On this view it is at least plausible that the conflict between science and religion should have broken out.

Was the conflict justified? On this same view the answer must be: No. What is involved is a question of personalities, of temperaments. The conflict is not between science and religion but between the scientist and the religious man. There can be no justification for complaining because others do not see things quite in the way you see them. You may think it is their misfortune, but you would be foolish to want to blame them for having a different temperament from your own. (Some men of course combine the scientific and the religious temperaments; but only *some* men do.)

The day will never come when all the world is Christian. Not everyone has the religious temperament, and of those that have it not all can find the Christian religion congenial. From the Christian point of view there is every justification for mission work, for some will always respond. But it is a psychological impossibility that all should. Being religious is too much a matter of temperament, and a man's temperament is not to be easily changed. (Indeed, no one who had considered the matter would want to say that conversion can ever be easily accomplished.) Herein lies the ground of the Church's encouragement, though in it may easily enough also lie the ground of her complacency. The fact that not all the world has turned to Christ does not mean that the Church has failed. The fact that some, however few, have done so means that the Church has so far succeeded.

D. H. LAWRENCE AND CONGREGATIONALISM

By A. WHIGHAM PRICE, M.A.

I—*The background of Chapel and home.*

FEW literary figures of this century have excited such bitter controversy as D. H. Lawrence (1885-1930). In the nineteen twenties and early thirties, a high degree of hysteria characterised the utterances both of his champions and his attackers. Now that the dust has settled, and that Lawrence has begun to recover from serious misrepresentation by both sides, from exaggerated publicity and from the neglect that invariably succeeds it, we are in a better position to examine and evaluate the work of this gifted and unusual writer. Such a scrutiny is, indeed, a duty: for, as has been said recently, "In view of the abuse that has been hurled at him by so many Christians, . . . some amends from that quarter (are) overdue. Lawrence can teach Christians lessons they should have known but have forgotten."¹ To discuss his insights is not, however, the purpose of this article: instead, it will seek to examine the influence upon him of his Congregationalist home and chapel, while a second article will attempt to elicit the lasting impress which this environment and its training left upon his character and ideas.

David Herbert Lawrence was born in 1885, the second youngest of five children born to an oddly ill-matched couple. Arthur Lawrence, his father, was a miner: a rough, extraverted type of man—intensely independent, quick-tempered, moody, almost illiterate, full of animal vitality and high spirits, and a heavy drinker. His mother, born Lydia Beardsall, was reputed to come "of a good old burgher family, famous Independents, who had fought with Colonel Hutchinson." Her father, George Beardsall, was a man who was liable to overdo his independency on occasion, being invariably engaged in a furious quarrel with somebody.² Lydia's grandfather, one John Newton, had been a copious writer of hymn-tunes.³ She herself had been educated at a private school, in which she later became a teacher. She was in many ways a typical product of the Victorian Dissenting Chapel—strict in matters

¹"Father Tiverton": *D. H. Lawrence and Human Existence* (1951) p. x.

²Two of the most prolonged were with Jesse Boot (founder of the Chemists) and William Booth (later to become General of the Salvation Army).

³1802-1886 (not to be confused with Cowper's friend of the same name). His tune "Sovereignty" is still used by Methodists (*Methodist Hymnbook* No. 356).

of faith and conduct, intellectual in her interests (she was a great reader, especially of poetry), strong and forceful in character, and possessed of that unshakeable conviction of her own rightness in all decisions which arouses wonder and envy in the hesitant and confused children of the twentieth century. The only respect in which Lydia was untypical of Victorian Dissent was that she seemed to possess no sense of humour whatever : like the inhabitants of Rosmersholm, when she was a child she did not cry and when she grew up she did not laugh. Mrs. Lawrence was an enthusiastic member of the Congregational Church at Eastwood, Nottinghamshire, where they lived : a church whose building was rudely known locally as "Butty's Lump"—an allusion to the fact that it had been built by deacons who were also influential at the colliery, men with whom the miners found it prudent to 'keep in' (if they wanted a 'good stint') by making generous donations to the chapel building fund.

Arthur and Lydia had married, presumably, as a result of that mysterious attraction of opposites which is so often the despair of young lovers' parents : he, to her, was a handsome, bearded, vital man—strong and physically attractive and a fine dancer ; she, to him, was a 'lady' and an educated one. Needless to say, it was an unhappy marriage : each possessed the kind of temperament that was exacerbated by the other. The wilder Mr. Lawrence became, the more puritanical and nagging and reproachful became his wife's attitude ; and the more Mrs. Lawrence put on superior airs and was openly contemptuous of her husband's earthy 'goings on,' the more time that gentleman would spend away from his home—either in the public house, where the atmosphere was happy, convivial and carefree, or else in going for long country walks with his mates. Then the couple would be short of money, and the row would begin again.

In such an atmosphere, Lawrence grew up : a delicate, oversensitive child who, unfortunately for him, had in some measure inherited the conflicting temperaments of both parents. From his mother he derived his sensitivity and his strong intellectual bent—from his father, vitality and a zest for life, an intense love of nature (more, indeed, than mere love : a sort of unusual feeling-awareness of it) and a supreme contempt for half-alive people, especially for those in bondage to the money-god and to an existence on a purely material level. From his mother, he acquired a curious ingrained bourgeois snobbery (later to emerge in a queer pride that his wife was a German baroness)—and from his father its antithesis, a working-class scorn for mealy-mouthed respectabilities and 'niceness' generally. As

often happens with delicate children, he tended to be his mother's favourite. Following the usual pattern of unhappy marriages, upon the children (and in particular upon her Benjamin) Lydia lavished all the love she could no longer give to her husband, while from them (and especially from Bert) she elicited the love for which she hungered, and which Arthur no longer gave her. This close emotional intimacy with his mother was to prove one of the major problems of Lawrence's life: he worked it out—as he himself admits—in his second novel, *Sons and Lovers*.⁴ Without an appreciation of this factor in his emotional make-up it is hardly possible to understand the man he was later to become, or the complexities of his character and temperament. To say that, however, is not to maintain that a study of this mother-son relationship solves all problems connected with his sometimes baffling character. Human beings are rarely capable of being 'explained' in terms of one simple set of labels.

It is not to be wondered at that, religious as she was, Mrs. Lawrence's principal 'escape-hatch' was the chapel, nor that she took her young family with her into that little community. It was in the Sunday School that Bert and his brothers and sisters came to find a second home,⁵ and in the chapel's Literary Society that, as we shall see, the young Lawrences and their contemporaries began to acquire a feeling for literature and sharpened their wits discussing the lectures. The part played by the local Dissenting chapel as a cultural and educative force has for too long been neglected by the historians of English life. The one-sided picture drawn by Mark Rutherford has been too uncritically accepted at its face value as a universally-

"It follows this idea: a woman of character and refinement goes into the lower class, and has no satisfaction in her own life. . . . As her sons grow up, she selects them as lovers—first the eldest, then the second. These sons are urged into life by their reciprocal love of their mother—urged on and on. But when they come to manhood, they can't love, because their mother is the strongest power in their lives, and holds them. . . . As soon as the young men come into contact with women, there's a split. . . . The battle goes on between the mother and the girl, with the son as object. The mother gradually proves stronger, because of the tie of blood. The son decides to leave his soul in his mother's hands, and go for passion. But almost unconsciously the mother realises what is the matter, and begins to die. The son casts off his mistress, attends to his mother dying. He is left in the end naked of everything. It is a great tragedy—it's the tragedy of thousands of young men in England. I think it was Ruskin's." (*Letter to Edward Garnett*, 14 Nov. 1912.) "I felt you had gone off from me a bit, because of *Sons and Lovers*. But one sheds one's sicknesses in books—repeats and presents again one's emotions, to be master of them" (*Letter to A. W. McLeod*, 27 Oct. 1913). Just how much 'sickness' there was to be shed is obvious to anyone who has read this novel: the conflict with which it deals is one with which all ministers are wearisomely familiar in the course of their pastoral work. Those who are unacquainted with Lawrence's work might well begin with this book. It conveys the full flavour of his early life in Eastwood, and the description of the mother's death is immensely powerful and quite harrowing to read.

"In Sunday School I am eternally grateful to old Mr. Rimington, with his white round beard and his ferocity. He made us sing! And he loved the martial hymns" (*Assorted Articles*, 1930, p. 162).

valid assessment of Dissent in general and of nineteenth century Congregationalism in particular.⁶ It is just here, indeed, that so many who have written about Lawrence have gone astray: the pleasures of ignorance have been too much for them. It is, for example, unfortunate (though understandable in writers who have had no contact with Free Church life) that uncertainty should exist as to the precise activities of the chapel Literary Society, and that it should be assumed that the programme of study embarked upon by its earnest members was confined to theological works.⁷ It is high time such writers were told that the chapel Literary Society, along with the Mutual Improvement Society and the 'penny readings,' was one of the great cultural forces operating upon the lower social levels of the English people. Such ignorance can be pardoned; but less excusable is the persistent misrepresentation of Congregationalism—and even a deliberate confusion of it with the more ranting and uncouth fringe of Methodism. Too often, terms of pitying patronage have been used to describe the religious faith and general ethos of the Lawrence family: "Vague hymn-singing pietism" says Mr. Eliot⁸ with gentlemanly contempt (would he like us to dismiss his Anglo-Catholicism as "vague ritualistic obscurantism"? Until he kindly enlightened us, we had not realised that there was something thoroughly reprehensible about singing hymns); "this powerful, raucous, religious emotionalism . . . a comprehensive programme of crude religious propaganda . . . evidently there was no escape from this slap-bang bibliolatry, holding-forth and hymn-singing" comments Mr. Aldington⁹ with an aesthetic shudder, no doubt turning hastily from "this queer religion of intolerance and self-conceit" to Ovid's *Liber Amoris*, lest he become overpowered by the odour of sanctity. Most absurd of all is this bland judgment: "His (i.e. Lawrence's) mother was full of the rather censorious evangelicism of her class and time: her religion insisted that there was only one narrow way to salvation ("the *blood* of the Lamb"), and

⁶As Somerset Maugham's portrait (in "Rain") of the inhibited Rev. Alfred Davidson has been generally accepted by those outside the Church as an admirable description of a typical missionary—perhaps the most damaging fictional character in modern letters, from the Church standpoint. But then human beings love to universalize the particular, especially when the portrait is of someone engaged in activities which are distasteful to them.

⁷See, for example, Richard Aldington: *Portrait of a Genius, but . . .* (1950), p. 37.

⁸*After Strange Gods* (1934) p. 39. He uses the phrase to describe Lydia Lawrence's religion.

⁹*op. cit.*, p. 16-7.

by the slightest deviation one risked hell-fire.”¹⁰ It would be interesting to hear the comments of the ministers the Lawrences ‘sat under’ on this pithy summary of their preaching (by one who never heard it). Such wild, untutored observations naturally irritate us, and perhaps it is foolish to be angered by them. After all, one can hardly expect sympathetic handling from Mr. Aldington,¹¹ who has always held old-fashioned and Swinburnean notions about Christianity (of which “ the Christian notion that sex is merely a hindrance to salvation ” (*op. cit.* p. 106) may be taken as a fair sample) : but it is less easy to be patient with Mr. Eliot’s Anglo-Catholic contempt as he glances condescendingly through the slits in the parish church’s ivory tower and beholds, with a comforting feeling of superiority, the ill-bred ‘enthusiasm’ of the Methodist miner and the Congregationalist grocer and the Presbyterian shepherd—all so tragically lacking in the graces conferred by a University education.

Over against all this misrepresentation, what are the facts about the Nonconformist chapel ? One need read no further than Halévy to appreciate the part played by Dissent in the civilisation of these islands ; and, as has been pointed out by an impartial observer,¹² “ The chapel, in the Lawrence circle, was the centre of a strong social life, and the focus of a still persistent cultural tradition . . . Congregationalism had a peculiarly strong intellectual tradition.” Those who grew up within the often grim-looking chapels with their “ stark brick, and big panes of greenish and raspberry glass in the windows ”¹³ were often more truly educated than many modern graduates in science or even in divinity. They read and enjoyed books which would certainly be rated as ‘stiff’ or ‘heavy’ by twentieth century middle-class perusers of biography and travel from the lending libraries—books

¹⁰Kenneth Young : *D. H. Lawrence* (1952) p. 16 : (Mr. Young’s italics). This type of light-hearted misrepresentation is the most annoying of all, since it occurs in a pamphlet published by the British Council : this will be mainly read by foreign students, who rely on the Council’s publications for their knowledge of the English scene, and who will scarcely expect to find fiction in a booklet carrying such a distinguished *imprimatur*. Mr. Aldington is obviously prejudiced, and doesn’t pretend to be anything else : but Mr. Young pretends to be scholarly, which is why he is so dangerous. The mild qualification with which he follows this judgment (“ Lawrence’s teaching, broader as it was, rested on that same structure ”) is conveniently vague, and serves no useful purpose except to protect the author against the obvious charge that he has simply not bothered to collect any facts, readily accessible though these are. He would seem not to have read the Memoir by “ E.T.” (Jessie Chambers, Lawrence’s first love) which one would have imagined to be basic required reading for anyone seeking to understand Lawrence’s early years—nor, indeed, those of Lawrence’s own articles in which he expresses his thankfulness for having escaped precisely this type of religion.

¹¹Though in fairness I should add that it was he who encouraged me to study the religious aspect of Lawrence.

¹²F. R. Leavis : article *Mr. Eliot and Lawrence*, in *Scrutiny*, vol. xviii.

¹³D. H. Lawrence : *Lady Chatterley’s Lover*, ch. xi.

which ranged over a very wide field of interest, and which were subsequently discussed with intelligence and sensibility: discussed, very often, not only from a very different standpoint, but also in a very different temper, from that which they would receive in the rarefied air of Oxford or Cambridge.¹⁴ For these simple folk inhabited no ivory tower: they were living at first hand, and their culture, as Dr. Leavis indicates, was related at every point to their everyday living, where "intellectual interests were bound up with the social life of home and chapel, and never out of touch with the daily business of ensuring the supply of the daily bread. The intellectual interests were not the less real for that."¹⁵ At the chapel, they learnt to think clearly and to express themselves logically and vigorously; they pondered deeply upon big issues—metaphysical, political, and philosophical as well as theological. They were lively critics of sermons (Jessie Chambers, as we shall see, had harsh things to say about the Anglican curate's preaching) and were, of course, soaked in the language and thought of the Bible. Up and down the country at that time, excellent little libraries were to be found in the tiny cottages of pitmen, shepherds and farm-labourers. Jessie, who was a farmer's daughter, mentions Hardy, Victor Hugo, Shakespeare and Blake as part of her reading. Her father read *Tess* aloud to his family, as it appeared in instalments in the *Nottinghamshire Guardian*. This reading was done when she and Lawrence were in their 'teens, and before the latter went to college. The list is only a casual one, collected from random references; but it compares very favourably with the reading of their children and grandchildren today—and no less favourably with that of people who would consider themselves to be their superiors, educationally and socially, in our age. It is interesting to recall that in County Durham within living memory, the male inhabitants of pit villages were popularly divided into two categories—'dog-men' and 'chapel-men.' The former, as the nickname implies, were those whose hobby was the breeding and racing of

¹⁴Compare Lawrence's violent dislike of Bertrand Russell, Maynard Keynes, Lytton Strachey and the whole Bloomsbury-in-Cambridge circle (analysed by Dr. Leavis in *The Common Pursuit*, pp. 255-260). The latter refutes the oft-repeated charge that Lawrence disliked this group because he, the ill-educated working-class provincial, felt inferior in their presence; and points out that, in actual fact, Lawrence had an "enormous advantage in *experience*." Lawrence wrote at the time, with his usual shrewdness: "What ails Russell is, in matters of life and emotion, the inexperience of youth. . . . It isn't that life has been too much for him, but too little." [Small wonder that the prophet of unyielding despair never forgave him, as his recent obtuse and rather childish broadcast talk on Lawrence revealed.] And "they talk endlessly, but endlessly—and never, never a good thing said. They are cased each in a hard little shell of his own, and out of this they talk words. There is never for one second any outgoing of feeling and no reverence, not a crumb or grain of reverence. I cannot stand it" (quoted by F. R. Leavis, *op. cit.* p. 259).

¹⁵*op. cit.* p. 258.

whippets, the latter those who, in their leisure time, were readers, students and 'discussers.' The significance of the grouping lies in the fact that those who were given the second label did not need to be religious in order to qualify: they might be freethinkers, atheists, or amateur politicians who had never crossed the threshold of a chapel in their lives. If their pursuits were serious and bookish, they were automatically dubbed 'chapel-men.' The fact that such a nickname should exist, and that it should be so applied, demonstrates how closely chapel and culture were linked in the popular working-class mind.

The earliest memoir of Lawrence was *D. H. Lawrence: a personal record*, by E.T. (Jessie Chambers), which contains first-hand recollections of the early days in Eastwood. This book makes it clear that the young Lawrences, and their contemporaries, shared to the full in this cultural environment of which the focal point was Eastwood Congregational Church. "The chapel at Eastwood," writes Jessie, "became the centre of our social life. There was a Literary Society, and we all paid one shilling for a membership card. I was wildly disappointed when some lecture to which I had looked forward with extravagant anticipation came, and my brother 'didn't feel like turning out.' Mother refused to let me go alone, though the lonely field path¹⁶ had no night terrors for me. I was only appeased when Lawrence,¹⁷ who went to the lecture, told me 'it wasn't up to much.' When the Chambers moved to a new farm which was still further from Eastwood, they made shift for a time with the local Anglican Church, which was "new, a conscience-gift from the land-enclosing aristocracy . . . lacking tradition of any kind, it had no roots in the place . . . its atmosphere was chilling. We who had been accustomed to hearing a reasoned discourse delighted to pick holes in the curate's string of platitudes that did duty for a sermon." Depressed by the spiritual coldness of the Church and "the stifling air of patronage," they soon preferred to face the long drive into Eastwood to the chapel, "where we had roots and traditions of a sort." They often gave Lawrence a lift on the way home, Mr. Chambers wishing "to discuss the sermon with him."

For the first six years of Lawrence's life, the minister at Eastwood was Rev. G. Wesley Butler,¹⁸ who was inducted

¹⁶The Chambers' farm was two miles out of Eastwood.

¹⁷In adult life, D.H.L. was universally known by his surname: even his wife addressed him thus. "Bert" he had always disliked, and "David" was "too Scriptural."

¹⁸Eastwood was his first charge. He subsequently ministered at Stoney Lane Church, Birmingham and Audley Range, Blackburn, and later, after acquiring a nervous affliction of the throat which made a regular ministry impossible, assisted his friend Dr. J. H. Jowett at Westminster Chapel. He died in 1951, in his 92nd year.

there in 1874; his successor was Rev. John Loosmore, who occupied the pastorate from 1892-8—the “charming young Welsh minister,” as Jessie describes him. Her father had a very high opinion of him. But the minister of Lawrence’s ’teens, for whom he obviously had much respect and whose friendship he valued, was Rev. Robert Reid,¹⁹ who was settled at Eastwood from 1898 to 1911. It was Mr. Reid who, after a bout of pneumonia had ended Lawrence’s employment as clerk with a firm of surgical instrument makers in Nottingham, persuaded the young man’s mother to allow him to fill a vacant place in the British School at Eastwood (which adjoined the Congregational church: Mr. Reid acted as correspondent between the school managers and the local Education Authority) as a pupil-teacher; it was he, too, who, during Lawrence’s first session at Nottingham University College four years later, gave him private coaching in Latin.

Soon afterwards, Lawrence began to read Huxley, Haeckel and Robertson (fashionable in those days), gradually drifted away from the Church and, after he took a teaching post in Davidson Road School, Croydon, explicitly repudiated Christianity. But he remained, to the end of his life, a man with a profoundly religious spirit, with an essentially religious view of life. Though his abandonment of Christianity is assumed, in Bohemian circles, to be a proof of his obvious emancipation and enlightenment, Lawrence himself always recognised the debt which he owed to the chapel and its influence, and, indeed, devoted one of his last articles to this very subject. “Nothing is more difficult” (he writes) “than to determine what a child takes in, and does not take in, of its environment. I think it was good to be brought up a Protestant; and among Protestants, a Nonconformist; and among Nonconformists, a Congregationalist. Which sounds pharasaic. But I should have missed bitterly a direct knowledge of the Bible, and a direct relation to Galilee and Canaan, Moab and Kedron, those places which never existed on earth.²⁰ And in the Church of England one could hardly have escaped those snobbish hierarchies of class, which spoil so much for a child. And the Primitive Methodists, when I was a boy, were always having ‘revivals’ and being ‘saved,’ and I always had a horror of being saved. So, altogether, I am grateful for my Congregationalist upbringing. The Congregationalists . . . avoided the personal emotionalism which one found among the Methodists when I

¹⁹Later minister at Pendleton, Lower Clapton, and Hartington Road, Liverpool. He retired in 1933 and died in 1955.

²⁰He probably means that they have a magic fairy-tale quality about them. Many men posted to Palestine during the war have testified to their astonishment at discovering these places actually existed.

was a boy.²¹ I liked our chapel,²² which was tall and full of light, and yet still ; and colour-washed pale green and blue, with a bit of lotus pattern. And over the organ loft 'O Worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness' in big letters . . . I am always glad we had the Bristol hymnbook,²³ not Moody and Sankey. And I am glad our Scotch minister [Rev. Robert Reid] on the whole avoided sentimental messes such as 'Lead, Kindly Light' or even 'Abide with Me.' He had a healthy preference for healthy hymns. . . . Thirty-six years ago,²⁴ even Sunday School teachers still believed in the fight for life and the fun of it. 'Hold the fort, for I am coming.' It was far, far from any militarism or gun-fighting. But it was the battle cry of a stout soul, and a fine thing too :

Stand up, stand up for Jesus,
Ye soldiers of the Lord." (*sic*.)

This tribute to the religion of his childhood—it occurs in an essay "Hymns in a Man's Life"—is obviously sincere, far removed from the kind of theatrical and patronising gesture made by Voltaire when he tipped his hat to a crucifix, or from the sentimental insincerities of suburban pagans ("Oh yes, we had some grand times at the chapel when I was a boy"). The whole essay testifies to the evocative power of Scripture and the powerful emotional overtones associated with the hymns one learns to love in childhood. Though these are, as Lawrence says, "often rather banal," he confesses, "They mean to me almost more than the finest poetry, and they have for me a more permanent value, somehow or other." Lawrence, indeed, wrote a superb poem on the Sunday night hymn sing-songs in his home, which evokes the past in a sharp and extraordinarily moving way, yet wholly without sentimentality :

"Messrs. Eliot, Aldington and Young, please note !

²¹A photograph of this appears in Harry T. Moore : *The Life and Works of D. H. Lawrence* (1951) at p. 192-3, where will also be found interesting photographs of Eastwood, and a snapshot of Jessie Chambers. This book is an admirable study of the man and his work. For a scrutiny of Lawrence's novels, see F. R. Leavis : *D. H. Lawrence, Novelist* (1955). Aldington's book has perhaps most about the man himself.

²²Lawrence is writing after a long lapse of time, and his memory is surely at fault here. *The Bristol Hymnbook* was the popular name for a collection edited by two Baptists, Ash and Evans ; but Rev. L. H. Bunn, the expert hymnologist, tells me he can trace no edition later than the 10th (1827). It seems highly unlikely that a book so old would still be in use at the beginning of this century. There are other cogent reasons against "Ash and Evans," with which the reader need not be wearied. Probably the Eastwood Chapel used either the "Congregational Hymnbook" of 1859 (with supplement, 1874), or the "Congregational Church Hymnal" of 1887, in conjunction with "The Bristol Tune Book" (2nd edn., 1876) which, as its name makes clear, is a book of tunes only. The title was embossed on the cover, and Lawrence may well remember seeing it on the pew ledge week by week, so that the word "Bristol" stuck in his mind.

²⁴He is writing in 1929, the year before he died of tuberculosis.

Softly, in the dusk, a woman is singing to me ;
Taking me back down the vista of years, till I see
A child sitting under the piano, in the boom of the
tingling strings
And pressing the small, poised feet of a mother who
smiles as she sings.

In spite of myself, the insidious mastery of song
Betrays me back, till the heart of me weeps to belong
To the old Sunday evenings at home, with winter
outside,
And hymns in the cosy parlour, the tinkling piano
our guide.

So now it is vain for the singer to burst into clamour
With the great black piano *appassionato*. The
glamour
Of childish days is upon me, my manhood is cast
Down in the flood of remembrance, I weep like a
child for the past.

The influence of these hymns, and of the Bible, remained with him all his life. His prose style, when it becomes descriptively lyrical, often owes a good deal to Biblical rhythms—for example, the oft-quoted passage at the beginning of *The Rainbow* (" But heaven and earth was teeming around them . . . ") which recalls Isaiah in the Authorised Version. The hymns became part of his being, and lines from them are perpetually creeping into his letters ; indeed, in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* his hero quotes " Lift up your heads, O ye gates " and " Blest be the tie that binds " in circumstances where a hymn would not normally flash into the mind of the most devout, namely as a kind of paeon of praise during love-making. Lawrence passionately believed—at a time when too many Christians had forgotten it—that sex was a profoundly religious, indeed sacramental, experience.

Such, then, was Lawrence's background, and such the formative influences of his early years. Throughout his adolescence, Eastwood Congregational Church was a focal point of his life, opening windows on a new intellectual world and providing a seedbed for his stirring genius. The next article will attempt to isolate those characteristic Congregationalist insights, principles and qualities of character which the chapel bequeathed to him as a perpetual possession, and to demonstrate that these could have been obtained nowhere else. It is impossible to imagine the-Lawrence-we-know with

a Roman Catholic, Anglican, or Methodist background. Long after he had discarded (or imagined he had discarded) Christianity, he remained a recognisable product of Congregationalism.

(to be continued)

*

*

*

Naught for Your Comfort by Father Trevor Huddleston (Collins, 12s. 6d.) is a cry from the heart of a dedicated Christian minister whose love of God and the African people shines from every page. Here in South Africa is something ominous, cruel and sinful in which all white people are made to see themselves involved. We all know something about it, but look at it with half-closed eyes, relieved that it does not touch us more closely. Father Huddleston is determined we shall open our eyes, see what is being done—and why—and examine our consciences. He shows us a national policy derived from a racial attitude working itself out in the actions of statesmen and churches and the lives of individual men and women. This is what the colour problem in South Africa is, and what is being done is an offence to God and man. At one point he throws off a contemptuous remark about the individualism which is one of the fruits of the Reformation, but the great power of this book is that it shows racial theories and national policies making the lives of simple people, if not solitary, even more poor, nasty, brutish and short. Here we are made to see that if you treat a man as a piece of mechanism, and deal with communities of men as you do a drove of oxen, you take away his birthright, you rob him of his most precious possession, himself. Here are Elias Mpikwa, beaten to death with a piece of hose-pipe, whose assailant was astonished to find himself convicted of common assault; the speaker in the House of Assembly who said "Native children need less food than white children because they sleep more"; the schoolboy Stephen Ramasodi who was refused a passport to take up a scholarship in the U.S.A.; the Tsotsi (Teddy boys) of Sophiatown.

It is possible to criticise this book as unfair to the white minority on whom must depend for a long time civilization in Africa. Whoever accepts political responsibility faces problems for which there are no doctrinaire solutions. But the present policy of apartheid based on "White supremacy now and always" leaves the African without hope. The open sore of Africa is still running; but in the gross darkness there is a smoking flax of which so great a faith and so dauntless a courage as this book reveals is a sign. Ed.

THE LAW OF LIFE

By ERIC PHILLIPS, D.Sc.

WHEN the last glacier retreated from this land of ours, it left behind great boulders. For twenty years I have watched one of these rocks in the foothills of the Drakensberg, weighing many tons, fight a losing battle with a Mkuhla tree. The tree evidently started in a seed lodged in a tiny pocket in the rock. When I first saw it, it was a sturdy sapling that had made a comfortable crevice for its roots. Today its irresistible growth has shattered the massive rock into fragments.

This is the law of life. The future belongs not to rigid absolutes, but to the thing that can grow, whether it is a tree, a democracy or a religious belief.

It is strange that a principle as familiar as this should today need underscoring, but we are living in years of uncertainty and fear, and fear induces a kind of spiritual astigmatism. To be sure, in our generation we have reason for our fears, and even justification to resist the threat that creates them. But fear is an evil in itself as well as for what it does to human emotions and reactions.

Nothing is static in this world, least of all our ideas. Even our conceptions of freedom and democracy are not static. Today the concept of freedom is taking on a larger meaning. Our generation is thinking of the threat to freedom which comes from poverty and insecurity, from social and economic conditions in which human beings cannot be free. In many countries, this new conception of freedom is struggling to make itself articulate, and irresistible change in older points of view is taking place before our eyes.

Democracy likewise must be reinterpreted from generation to generation. Its limits were not finally determined by the political concepts of the 18th century. Rather it is a growing, dynamic faith, a perpetually evolving adjustment between freedom and justice, between individual rights and the demands of society. This adjustment, however, is never perfectly and finally attained; it remains a problem which mankind must solve again and again.

This needs to be re-emphasised today because our current fear of Communism is driving some of us to believe that change is somehow subversive, and that anyone who advocates new ideas is probably a fellow-traveller who should be watched. If you favour fair employment practices or are concerned about civil liberties, if you oppose religious and racial prejudice, you

are likely to be suspected as a knowing participant in the Communist Front, or at least as a witless dupe of Moscow. There is hardly a progressive organisation or undertaking in the country to which the adjective 'Communitic' has not been applied in the last few years. In many instances, teachers and professors have been frightened into silence, and even the pulpit has not been free from fear. The tragedy is that this plays into the hands of the Communists. It identifies Russia with the process of social change.

There are plenty of arguments against Communism. It is a facade for a ruthless tyranny. It is a brutal hoax by which millions of confused and hungry people are persuaded or coerced to sign away their freedom in exchange for Utopian promises. But to paste the label of Communism on the yearnings of men everywhere for a better life, to classify as subversive those efforts for social justice toward which democracy is moving, is to concede to the Communists all the best arguments and make a mockery of the faith that sustains us.

I do not underestimate the necessity of keeping the Communists clear of government and rooting out treachery wherever it may be found. Split loyalties or loyalties that respond to strings pulled in Moscow cannot be tolerated. We must know who our enemies are. But if in an attempt to exorcise evil we proscribe the good as well, the damage will be irreparable. We must not act as if the term Communism covers all the plans and dreams of men for making this world a home to live in instead of a place to freeze and fight and starve in. It is undoubtedly part of Communist strategy to frighten us into a position which seems to identify democracy with outmoded patterns of social thinking.

In our concern over what Communism may do to democracy we have overlooked the danger of what we ourselves may do to democracy under the stimulus of fear. Challenged by authoritarianism men begin to build an authoritarianism of their own; they answer heresy-hunting with heresy-hunting; they become like the thing they fight. Fighting fire with fire is an easy but misleading slogan which has betrayed more than one cause in the past. That is what fear does to people. If the tactics of the Soviets succeed in inducing us to try to stamp out dissent and to measure loyalty by conformity, then they have manoeuvred us into retreating before the battle has begun.

Democracy holds its pre-eminent place in the world because it welcomes diversity of opinion. There has been no fixed creed to which the citizen of the democracies has had to

subscribe, no Siberia for intellectual and spiritual non-conformists. The democratic way has been healthy and vigorous because dissenters have been permitted to think critically of the political, social and economic order in which they live. No official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, religion, or other matters of opinion.

It is this philosophy of growth that gives assurance in the present crisis. Communism, by encasing itself in an ironclad orthodoxy, is sealing its own ultimate doom. Communists taunt the believers in democracy for being the supporters of a crumbling *status quo*, but it is they who are trying to maintain a *status quo* far more rigid and absolute than anything the world has ever seen. They boast of their 'new order.' The democracies have a new order based on the capacity of each generation to experience what Abraham Lincoln called "a new birth of freedom." In the evolution of democracy we have a world that is perpetually young. It is only free men who dare to think. And it is only through free thought, freely expressed, that the soul of a people can be kept alive.

There has seldom been an easy companionship between politics and religion, and it is with a sense of growing concern that South Africans find themselves almost daily reminded of the gulf that is widening between the Church and the Government.

Rightly or wrongly one of the more frequently heard criticisms of the Church during the past forty years has been of its backwardness in coming forward ; of its reserve rather than its outspokenness. Whatever reasons or excuses may be advanced in support or rebutment of this charge, it can no longer be argued that the Church lacks anything in fearlessness in the manner of its reaction to the administrative machinery being employed by the State to give effect to the policy of Apartheid.

After long and earnest consideration behind closed doors the indignation of the Church at what it honestly believes to be a retrogressive, unjust and morally indefensible State policy is now being freely expressed in the lay press and from the public platform.

To all people concerned with the welfare and well-being of the Union this conflict between the spiritual and the secular organs of national life is a matter for deep concern. Yet it cannot be stressed too strongly the dispute is neither of the making nor of the choosing of the Church.

It is the duty of the country's religious leaders to present the truth as they see it ; to preach, to practise and to proclaim

the fundamentals of decent living ; to denounce and to fight injustice ; to acknowledge no compromise between right and wrong and to uphold before all men, whether they be the highest or the lowliest in the land, the great moral and spiritual principles of the Christian faith.

In this task the Church has come into collision with two of the main instruments of government—the Legislature and the Executive, the members of which, supported by the clergy of the religious denomination to which they belong, have repudiated emphatically the strictures directed against their policy of Apartheid.

South Africa is thus faced with a situation in which the difference between the main body of Churches and the State would seem to be irreconcilable. And the tragedy of the position is that unless the Government is prepared to make some worthwhile concession—for it is inconceivable that the Church can make any major retreat—race relations will continue to deteriorate.

This is essentially a controversy that South Africans must strive to settle amongst themselves. While it would be foolish to reject the helpful guidance and kindly direction of friends overseas, outright condemnation from such quarters is quite the wrong method of approach.

In this struggle to evolve a policy that is fair to all and unjust to none, that will replace despair with hope that is basically workable rather than idealistically impracticable, that will sweep fear from imprisoned minds, that will supplant selfishness by tolerance, the stake is nothing less than the conscience of a whole nation.

Human effort alone will not resolve this crisis, which calls, as never before, for deep meditation and united prayer.

I cannot help but feel that the situation in which we find ourselves is due to a distinct and deliberate attempt to flout the universal law of growth for the advantage of one section of the population. A race cannot remain static : it must advance spiritually, morally, mentally and technically or it will decline and be lost in the limbo of forgotten peoples.

What is so damnable is that in this fair land of ours a white despotism is being set up under the cloak of Christianity. We are told that the Holy Scriptures are the all-sufficient and infallible word of God, and that the authority of the Scripture is normative for all man's political, social, cultural and religious concerns. Those who want to maintain Apartheid on biblical grounds are labouring under a grave misunderstanding. The fundamental Christian principles which should govern all our relationships with other human beings, regard-

less of their colour or social status, are stated very simply : Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy mind and with all they soul and with all thy strength; and thy neighbour as thyself. There is nothing more universal and comprehensive than those two great twin-principles. They have the authority of our Lord himself.

No power on earth can prevent the development of the under-privileged. Development may be retarded and confined to predetermined channels, but by immutable natural law the final issue will be unchanged. Unfortunately, the canalization of the development of a people in this way inevitably leads to upsurgings of the human spirit in which some of the more ardent souls, inspired by gleams of truth, demand accelerated progress or a change in the order of development. They are dubbed Communists by the controlling power, and their actions are said to be subversive. This is what is happening in South Africa.

But what is more searching to the human soul is that man has been shorn of his dignity. He is herded, willy nilly, from one place of habitation to another at the whim of the Government. It is true that better houses are being provided with improved social amenities. But there is not the slightest justification for compulsorily removing a whole community and then razing to the ground all the buildings in the area. Civic surveys have indicated that only a small proportion of the dwellings could be classed as slums. The compulsory removal venture is not slum clearance. For that there might be some justification. The present plan may have far-reaching and disastrous results, and stands condemned before the consciences of Christian men everywhere.

I quote from Rev. Dr. J. B. Webb : " One of the highest doctrines of Christianity concerns the dignity and worth of personality. Beyond all the specific acts and policies of which we are guilty today, which in themselves deny a dignity and worth to the personality of non-Europeans which we desire to be accorded to ourselves, we stand condemned for another failure—that of refusing to treat a fellow man as a fellow son of God and a brother in Jesus Christ. If we sat for seven days where these people sit now ; and if we were treated by them as we treat them, would we be satisfied and happy ? The answer to that question determines the degree to which we have succeeded in applying our fundamental Christian principles."

There always have been many men and women who declare that certain privileges should be denied to certain sections of humanity—not because they are wrong in themselves, nor

because they would lead irresponsible people into immoral conduct, but because such a universal granting would damage some special group, or some political, religious or social organization. But the history of mankind shows that reason has always conquered those who thus try to restrict it. Again and again the attempt has been made. Again and again it has failed. It is being made now, and it will fail once more. The will of God is that man be not regimented, but remain free to develop, to evolve. No power on earth can stop this growth, and woe betide those persons, governments and nations who attempt to flout the divine purpose.

JOHANN GOTTFRIED HERDER

By SYDNEY H. MOORE, M.A.

ONE of the most interesting and fascinating groups in all literary history is that assembled in Weimar at the close of the eighteenth century. Each member of it exercises attraction of a different but wholly compelling order. There are the two royalties, Karl August and Anna Amalie; Schiller, the prince; Goethe, the king; Wieland, the kindly and learned cynic; Herder, the preacher and philosopher—not one is alike, not one but proves on closer acquaintance to be such an individual as we rarely encounter but have always wished to meet.

Today it is the last mentioned who is claiming much attention. The great book just written by Professor R. T. Clark¹ is only the latest of many studies given to this man whose "inexhaustible sea of ideas" has since 1803 furnished the world of philosophy and letters with an ocean of treasure as attractive as was the Spanish Main to our Elizabethan ancestors. True, he was not a 'makker,' a poet, a creative genius. Yet as a spiritual force, an intellectual innovator, an apprehender of far-reaching ideas, an inspired pointer out, to the nineteenth century and ourselves, of new ways and profitable paths, he is perhaps the least removed from us of the entire Weimar group and certainly one of its most human figures. It is to this Herder, the man as he lived and moved among his fellows, not to the inspirer of Darwin and Hegel, that the present sketch is devoted.

To understand Herder it is necessary, more than with the other giants of Weimar, to know what he had done previously. Each of the others did his main work after arrival at the little capital on the Ilm (Herder himself said it was neither a town nor a village; its inhabitants numbered only 7,000); his own life-work was practically finished within six years of his coming there.

He derived from what was known until 1944 as East Prussia—the only northerner in the circle. Perhaps that is one reason why he was its most 'difficult' member. Another possibly is to be found in the homes from which those members had come. Goethe was the son of a well-to-do councillor at Frankfort; Schiller's father was an able military surgeon under the patronage of the Duke of Württemberg; Wieland, a pastor's son, had moved in cultured circles from the outset. But

¹Herder, *His Life and Thought*, C.U.P., London, 1955.

Herder's father, an assistant master in a girls' school, was a desperately poor man. At times, his son tells us, two small rolls of unbuttered bread were all he had to eat in twenty-four hours. "How different and how far happier is your childhood than mine ever was," he remarked one day to his children.

But if he was poor, he could read. The booksellers in both Mohrunen and Königsberg gave him permission to read every book they had; he did so and wished for more. When he saw a book in a house window, he would ask if he might borrow it to read. With truth he was called "a library on two legs." He had a grim time when he went to the University, his whole wealth, three thalers, in his pocket. But through his reading he came to know Königsberg's greatest professor, Kant, and step by step he carried all before him till in 1765 he was appointed Master and Preacher at the Cathedral School, Riga. There he read everything he could lay hands on—then it became to him 'a scholars' desert.'

It was at Riga that he increased the books of the world by a most novel one of his own: *Fragments concerning recent German Literature*. On each page of it a new note was struck. Germany's latest great critic was Lessing, who was keenly interested in form, construction and expression in literature—a most necessary thing at the time. But such matters interested Herder little. Lessing's platform was 'Understanding,' Herder's might be summed up rather as 'Feeling.' It was not a writer's tools, his metres and rhymes which he cared about, but his ideas, his theories, his humanistic approach. So the *Fragmente* contrasted German and Oriental art and poetry, the unfortunate dominance of Latin, the way in which German was continually influenced by other literatures. "Make your characters German," he said, "and don't try to dress them up in Greek or Roman or French fripperies."

The whole country was struck by so original a point of view. "Who is this new Pindar who has arisen among you?" queried Winckelmann from Rome. The book struck the dominant note of its author's life. Goethe, Schiller, Wieland were citizens of the world of true cosmopolitan stamp. Herder was a German of the Germans, with all their tender sentimentality, their mystic reserve, their unashamed egotism.

Whilst still at Riga he produced another book even more intriguing, *The Woods of Criticism*. As in the *Fragmente*, he insists on the existence of two types of poetical composition, 'natural poetry,' the speech of the youth of the world—Homer, Shakespeare, Ossian; and 'art poetry,' the speech of an adult world, cultivated and therefore unnatural—Virgil, Dante,

Racine. In the first type we have the voice of nature herself, unadorned, impromptu ; in the second we find the ornamental, the bedecked, the unnatural.

Riga was now not only 'a scholars' desert' but also a place where the clergy were beginning to attack his conception of orthodoxy, so he decided to see the world for himself and set off on a long voyage, in 1769, coasting Sweden, Denmark, Scotland, England and ending at Nantes. This cruise forms the background for one of his most interesting books, *Journal of my Journey*. It is a record of the dreams, social, literary, political, religious, which came to him as he paced the deck night and day. In Nantes and Paris he stayed for some time, studying among other things education and the ideas he was later to try to introduce into the schools of Saxe-Weimar-Eisenach. Returning via Hamburg (where he met Claudius and Lessing) to Kiel, he undertook a tutorship to the Prince of Holstein whom he was to conduct on an educational tour through Italy. In Darmstadt he learnt to know Goethe's friend Merck and the lady, Karoline Flachsland, who later became his own wife. But at Strasburg the plan broke down; Herder went into hospital with eye trouble and the Prince of Holstein journeyed on alone.

It was there, in Strasburg, that one of the great events of his life was to happen. One day a young man of 21 was ushered into the dark room of the young writer of 26. To him, Goethe, he taught all the latter knew that was worth knowing. Professor Clark says: "Without that meeting at Strasburg there might never have been the young Goethe whom we know; and Götz, Werther and Faust I. might never have been written." Goethe himself admits, "The most important event, an event which was to have the weightiest consequences for me was my acquaintance, and the intimacy which followed close upon its heels, with Herder." In the dim light of that room of pain they met again and again, and their discussions were endless: on Shakespeare, on Homer, on the nature of poetry, the function of speech, on style, Gothic architecture, Rousseau, Fielding, Goldsmith, Percy. In sum, he taught Germany's greatest son to observe with his own eyes, to perceive that great work is only possible by direct contact with life and with high thought.

Personally, Strasburg for Herder was a failure. After three operations he writes to Karoline: "My course of treatment is now over. . . . After all the pain, cost, exhaustion, delays, bother and mortification, it [the eye] is worse than ever. . . . Ah, how I intended to return to you—and how do I really return!"

The impasse in which he now found himself was overcome by his appointment as Court Preacher at Bückeburg, a little town in the midst of the lovely Lippe country. Thither after two years he brought home his bride from Darmstadt. In the same year he collaborated with Goethe and others in a book where his ideas are much more fully developed than heretofore, *Of German Manners and Art*. "I look at poetry," he says there, "as a kind of Proteus among the peoples, which changes its form according to language, manners, habits, temperament, climate, nay, even according to the accents of the different nations." By this idea of 'national idiosyncrasy' he corrects the excessive reverence of Winckelmann and Lessing for Greek art. Classic art, he contends, must not for ever be an unchanging type, valid for all peoples and all times, and goes on to explain Shakespeare, whom he understands far better than Lessing had done. The book was a manifesto of the young rebels; it was to become the vade-mecum of the group of writers now forming, whom we classify as *Sturm und Drang*.

But Herder was a preacher, and his next two books, *The Oldest Documents of Humanity* and *The Spirit of Hebrew Poetry*, were refreshing after the fusty theological works of the day. They lay well and truly the foundations of the study of comparative religion which has since then gone so far. Religion, he maintained, did not begin with fear, as Hume had fulminated, but from a sense of human need. Innate morality is greater than race, is found in all races. And since Christianity corresponds most closely to that morality and to the needs of humanity, it must perforce be the best religion.

In 1775 Goethe had settled in Weimar, where he soon found that a 'General Superintendent' was needed for the church and for education. He had to work hard to obtain the appointment for Herder, now regarded more than ever by the orthodox as a heretic, but in the end he succeeded and in 1776 Herder found himself ministering in the old church at Weimar where Luther had preached against Tetzl and where Johann Sebastian Bach had played the organ for nine years. His preaching took the *Weimaraner* by storm. By it he had first won the heart of Karoline and by it he won the hearts of a majority of his new congregation. Schiller reports it as being "full of soul, of force, of fire." Böttiger, like Crabb Robinson, a fine 'noser' for news, writes to a friend: "One could see that all he said sprang from the course of his argument. Apparently each period was only formed as he spoke it, in that exquisite roundness and perfect adequacy of expression . . . which I cannot sufficiently admire. One thing was noteworthy from

beginning to end: Herder does not make a single motion with his hands, which remain clasped in the folds of his gown. But all the more expressive is the pose of the rest of his body, all the more significant each rise and fall of his beautiful, sonorous voice." Bottiger goes on to state that one needed great erudition to understand his sermons, yet from another source we learn that the poor people especially loved them. After one effort even Wieland had to admit: "He preached like a god." Schiller was harder to please when he had definitely linked his fortunes with Weimar, "It was less a speech than a reasoned conversation and . . . would have been as fitting in a mosque as in a Christian church."

Unfortunately, whilst his stay in the Residenz meant twenty-seven years of hard work and some accomplishment, there developed in those years much bitterness and frequent alienation from those who wished to be Herder's friends. Within a year or two of his arrival we find Wieland writing: "I have retired into my shell: the man is impossible; he is like a thundercloud, full of electricity. From afar the meteor makes a fine impression but may I be preserved from close proximity to such a volcano."

Actually Herder was a super-sensitive man with a distinct leaning towards querulousness. He "is like an instrument of exquisite tone in which by some fault of mechanism a slight but oft-recurring jar mars the harmony." All who had much to do with him came to dread his *persiflierenden beizenden Witz*. Schiller tells his friend Körner of the amusing fallings-out even of husband and wife and ends by commenting on their debts. Schiller on the subject of debt is more than a little comical and suggests Sancho Panza's proverb about talking of rope in the house of a man who has been hanged.

But there were many grounds for Herder's short-temperedness. He was above his post; he would have ruled anywhere. In a State without a Goethe he would have made a world-wide reputation. His salary, too, was always small. Constant poverty and ill-health followed on a youth of wretched privation. He was never a healthy man and the suffering from his eye was chronic. Most of all his position was uncongenial. He was Court Preacher, President of the Consistory Court, Inspector of schools and churches; he examined all boys leaving the gymnasium, he appointed all the clergy. The Saxe-Weimar clergy had no wish for so gifted a man to supervise their labours. His great plans for schools (he was one of the foremost pedagogues of his day) were never accepted; he could gain for them no money, no sympathy, no interest. As Karoline points out in her memoirs: "Every approach to an

attempt towards the betterment of education, if it came from him, seemed suspicious to his consistory court and was opposed as impracticable." Few shared his concern for the welfare of the church. Goethe never came there, Karl August only at funerals and weddings.

And those were dark days for the Church. Great hearts like Claudius held the fort, but far more agreed with Fichte, the clever young Jena professor who prophesied: "In five years' time there will be no religion left; reason will be our only religion."

And so the trying days went by, and tempers were frayed and friendships grew tenuous. Goethe, who always admired his gifts, was forced to admit: "One can never approach him without rejoicing in his mildness; one can never quit him without being hurt by his bitterness." No one can ponder over his career without realising that it was a strangely unhappy, strangely inadequate life for the man Herder in truth was. We see his tireless labours and his success and ability in revolutionising the modern teaching of history. How remarkably in his greatest book, *Ideas on the Philosophy of Human History* he foreshadowed the thoughts of Darwin and Spencer! Every line he wrote was instinct with a pure and noble spirit. His Christianity, as Hume Brown has pointed out,² was a Christianity understood by him in the most liberal sense, one free from dogma, "a spirit rather than a creed."

Least appreciated and least understood of all the Weimar circle, Herder was the first to leave it. Lying on his death-bed in 1803, attended by his ever faithful Karoline, he whispered: "If only a great new intellectual idea would come from somewhere and grip me through and through, I should recover." But it was *from* him that the new ideas had gone and for them there was no return. His statue stands before his church in the market place of Weimar. Upon it are graven the words, LICHT, LIEBE, LEBEN (Light, Love, Life). They were the life-long ideals of one of the most brilliant and most unhappy among the sons of men.

²*Life of Goethe*, I. 62, London, 1920.

REVIEWS

The reviews are in four divisions :

Theology and relevant studies : works of scholarship ranging from dogmatic theology and church history to psychology and cosmology.

Religion, life and work : books concerned with the daily application of religion and its popular exposition.

Miscellanea, a limited selection from current general literature.

Periodical publications.

THEOLOGY

AND RELEVANT STUDIES

The Flood and Noah's Ark. By ANDRE PARROT. 76 pp. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

The Tower of Babel. By ANDRE PARROT. 75 pp. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

Following his introductory volume *Discovering Buried Worlds* in the series "Studies in Biblical Archaeology," the editor of the series, Prof. André Parrot, has written these two further volumes. Both are well illustrated with photographs and line-drawings.

The volume on *The Flood and Noah's Ark* is a model of how to arrange rather complex material neatly. First the literary evidence is sifted. The Jahvistic and Priestly versions of the Flood are printed one after the other ; then summaries of and extracts from the *Epic of Gilgamesh* in the Assyrian and Babylonian versions are provided. These are followed by similar treatment of the *Epic of Atrahasis*, based on the Sumerian and Akkadian versions. A gentle irony can be detected in Parrot's discussion of the Ark, especially when he deals with the expeditions which, from time to time, go in search of its remains.

The volume on *The Tower of Babel* pays more attention to the theological significance of the subject. Parrot rejects the view which regards the Tower of Babel as a monument of human insolence against God. In effect, he regards the Ziggurat (of which the Tower of Babel was but one example) as a temple erected to ensure communication between heaven and earth.

God and Man in Early Israel. By J. W. D. SMITH. 122 pp. Methuen. 5s. 6d.

This small book is designed as a companion to the Bible. It is intended to meet the requirements at the 'O' level of the G.C.E. examination in Religious Knowledge. There are 5 maps and the period covered stretches from the Patriarchs to Solomon. There is plenty of excellent material in the book although the style is rather dull. One has the suspicion that the Biblical material could be more up-to-date. There is no sign of the influence of, e.g., Von Rad in Dr. Smith's treatment of Gen. 15 ; and his discussion of Abraham about to sacrifice Isaac would have been illumined if he had used Rabbi Hertz on Gen. 22. Further, is it true to say (page 10) that "Abraham was ready to live as Jesus said that men should live" ? What about Sarah and Abimelech ?

Sacral Kingship in Ancient Israel. By AUBREY R. JOHNSON. 155 pp. University of Wales Press. 12s. 6d.

What a wealth of learning is in this book ! There is no other book in English that brings together so much technical information about the Psalms, arranged so interestingly, written so freshly and so fully documented. It is a major contribution to the subject. Prof. Johnson limits himself to the Psalms which deal with either the Kingship of Yahweh or the Royal Psalms. He is abreast, if not ahead of, the best Scandinavian scholarship in this field. There is a freshness in the translations he offers. At the same time, there is a scholarly caution throughout the argument of the book. He deals with such things as the Covenant between Yahweh and the House of David, the Temple and the Cult, the divine triumph over evil cosmic forces, the kings and their relation to Yahweh, and a Davidic Messiah. These and other topics are set against the background of Israel's worship as recorded in the Psalms and as illuminated by information derived from the religious practices of Israel's neighbours.

The Book of Daniel. By E. W. HEATON. 251 pp. S.C.M. 12s. 6d.

The evaluation of any Commentary on Daniel depends largely on the editor's handling of Chapter 7. This is the chapter dealing with 'Visions' and the 'Son of Man.' It also forms the point of entry for much of the symbolism and mythology of the ancient world into Christian Theology. In this 'Torch Bible' Commentary the writer steers a middle course between reading too much into the text and being over-influenced by the more recent writing on the subject. He boldly demands that the commentator give rein to his imagination, but as he says, "not *free* rein." Compared with older commentators like Driver and Montgomery, he shows a greater freedom in handling Babylonian materials and greater simplicity in dealing with theological matters.

JAMES WOOD.

The Nature and Function of Priesthood. By E. O. JAMES. 886 pp. Thames and Hudson. 25s.

Here is an interesting book covering a very wide field of anthropological study. The author's purpose is to describe the various forms priesthood has assumed in history rather than to defend or attack any particular ancient or modern priestly claims. He begins with primitive magic, and right away the reader is impressed by the likeness of the primitive method (e.g. in the need for exactitude of words or properly controlled initiation to ensure a due succession of power) to sundry contemporary theories and practices, an impression which continues all through, for Prof. James shows how the basic elements of the priesthood remain fairly constant across a great variety of ages and cultures. The purpose of priesthood which he draws out from his examples is : "As occasion demands the priest has to mediate, expiate and absolve ; reveal, conserve and guard sacred learning and knowledge ; administer and maintain the hierarchic organization in relation to the social structure ; and above all to stand between heaven and earth at the altar as the master of sacrifice" (p. 293). In every detail the author illustrates from a wide variety of races and cultures, but of them all he uses most largely the Hebrew priesthood as most familiar and most influential on Christian developments, which are also noticed at some length. It is a pity there are so many annoying misprints, at least fifty, both in English and, even more commonly, in foreign words.

A. M. PRICE,

Royal Priesthood. By T. F. TORRANCE. 108 pp. Oliver and Boyd. 9s.

This is No. 3 of the Occasional Papers of the Scottish Journal of Theology. Professor Torrance offers his work as a contribution to present discussions on the Biblical Doctrine of the Church and Ministry, and has particularly in mind the talks on reunion now proceeding between the Church of England and the Church of Scotland. He believes that the time has come for the two Churches to unite "in a plenitude of faith and order in which neither will be the poorer but both be the richer." An examination of the Biblical evidence shows that the priesthood of the Old Testament had a double character: that of mediation of God's Word and priestly witness to God's revealed will. The peril in which Israel always stood was that of making the sacrificial priesthood stand by itself, independent of the mediation of the Word. In the New Testament Jesus Christ is proclaimed as Apostle and High Priest, His Royal Priesthood being expressed in Word and Action. Priestly language is also applied to the Church, showing that the Church is given corporately to participate in His Ministry, both mediating God's Word to men and expressing man's response in the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. Within the corporate priestly ministry of the Church there is the special priesthood of the ministry; and this ministry within the Body should be articulated in a corporate way—the corporate episcopate in which compresbyters hold the episcopate *in solidum*. Also within the presbytery and presiding over it is the bishop "who is a fellow-presbyter in the presbytery but who permanently presides over it as bishop. He might be described as bishop *in presbyterio*" (p. 104). Dr. Torrance notes that in the Church of England the presbyter is regarded as a delegate of the bishop in that he does not hold the episcopate *in solidum* with the bishop. The Anglican episcopate is thus given an individualist expression in a single bishop. In the Church of Scotland the presbyter is a presbyter-bishop who, along with his fellow-presbyters, holds and exercises the episcopate *in solidum* in the presbytery. Consequently, in the Church of Scotland the episcopate is given a corporate or collegiate expression.

"It would seem right and proper," writes Dr. Torrance, "and wholly in accord with the Biblical doctrine of the ministry, that this *Presbytery* or *Corporate Episcopate* should be assimilated to what is known as the *Historic Episcopate*. In the integration of the bishop with presbytery both the episcopal and presbyterial traditions would not only be preserved but deepened and enhanced through fuller integration with the royal priesthood of the whole Body and fuller participation in the One Bishopric of Christ" (p. 104). Dr. Torrance further suggests that, since the Lord's Supper is not a cognitive Sacrament acknowledging a prior unity but an effective Sacrament enacting a real unity, the two Churches which are seeking a way to reunion should come together without restriction at the Table of the Lord as soon as possible.

JAMES M. TODD.

The New Man : Christianity and Man's Coming of Age. By RONALD GREGOR SMITH. 120 pp. S.C.M. 10s. 6d.

Otherworldliness and the New Testament. By AMOS N. WILDER. 126 pp. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

The Biblical Doctrine of Justice and Law. By H. H. SCHREY, H. H. WALZ, and W. A. WHITEHOUSE. 208 pp. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

The editor of the S.C.M. Press has given us an interesting and well written study of the Christian understanding of man. He stresses the fact

that the Bible finds the meaning of God and man in historical events, and insists that its this worldly understanding of life, which was hidden by medieval metaphysic, was recovered in the Renaissance, when society did not become pagan but human because eschatological. Neither autonomous secularized man nor the life of the Church can do without the other. Archaism, heteronomism, fundamentalism and liberalism, all come to grief because they are based on a partial or distorted understanding of what has been happening to man during the centuries of the modern world. The guiding clue lies in Rudolf Bultmann's perceiving in the Christ event a transcendence which shines through history, and in Dietrich Bonhoeffer's dialectic between the worldliness of God and the secret of discipline. The new man is man in community with man in the strength of the given grace which meets him as tasks and responsibilities and opening freedoms in actual situations in their wholeness.

Mr. Gregor Smith on his opening page says that he is presenting a view of the Christian understanding of man which, if it is acceptable, will have important consequences for problems of evangelism and communication. Readers of the book may very well be divided into those who think that this is a prophetic affirmation which is bound to grow in power and influence, and those who think that it cannot be made concrete enough to overcome these problems.

Dr. Wilder's book in many ways chimes in with the preceding one. By his title he really means "The false spirituality of the message and life of modern Christianity." He welcomes modern 'biblical theology' but thinks that it may lay too much stress on 'the preached word.' "To be a Christian," he insists, "is something that goes deeper than our ideas and confessions and deeper than our code of behaviour. . . . It means belonging to a community whose members participate . . . in a revelatory history. . . . To share in this *life* is to appropriate the revelation in just as real a sense as to hear it proclaimed." So he insists upon studying the significance of Jesus and the resurrection faith in the social historical human situation, and believes that only in this way can they be saved from a false other-worldliness which makes them irrelevant today. Dr. Wilder, in these lectures, is more successful in analysis than in construction. His appeal to John Doe to take Christianity for granted and to find the leadings and charities of God in the daily dust of life, however desirable, may meet with less success than he seems to imagine.

The third book, which is No. 3 in a series of Ecumenical Biblical Studies is, alas, not well written. It is an attempt to render in English a German discussion and some parts of it will be found to be difficult and obscure. It may be divided into three sections. One is concerned with recent ecumenical discussion on justice and law (to be found on pages 37-48; 153-197); this should be read first and is very interesting. The main part of the book (which is also the most valuable) is a section on 'The Bible and the righteousness of God' (pp. 45-114); this is a most illuminating study of the meaning of righteousness in the Bible. The third part of the book may be taken to be the section on the Bible and human justice (pp. 115-152), which does not deal very satisfactorily with the understanding of law in the Bible. The introductory section on Justice and Law (pp. 11-37) is both difficult to read and from a British point of view unsatisfactory in treatment. The practice of ecumenical Bible study is beset with many difficulties and this book is not wholly successful either in form or in content.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Man's Knowledge of God. By WILLIAM J. WOLF. 189 pp. Gollancz. 12s. 6d.

The Renewal of Man. By ALEXANDER MILLER. 184 pp. Gollancz. 12s. 6d.

These are the first two volumes in 'The Christian Faith' Series devised, it would seem, in America, with Reinhold Niebuhr as Consulting Editor. They are intended for the intelligent general reader, and though some of them may be creative work within the contemporary theological renaissance, the purpose which they seem most likely to serve is to offer a non-technical account of the modern theological mind (Reformed and ecumenical) to people who do not read the larger books. This task has not been successfully attempted since the pre-Barthian era. There is now sufficient common ground, and sufficient time has elapsed for the chief features of this ground to be seen in perspective.

Professor Wolf is at the Episcopal Theological Seminary, Cambridge, Mass., and has worked with the World Council in laymen's work. His formula for revelation is "divinely guided event inseparably united with the believing interpretation of that event" with "God the Father as the source of the event and God the Spirit as realising and inspiring the human response to the event. God the Son is the highest pitch of the formula in which the event is fused into the person of the God-man, the perfect togetherness of divinely guided event and human response." Elsewhere we are told that it is a "pattern of election, witness, suffering and service" which God communicates. The book examines the ground for this contention in Scripture and in the Church's response, and evaluates it in relation to reason and to non-Christian religions (though this latter point is weakly handled).

Professor Miller is now at Stanford University, having in his time created that gadfly periodical *The Presbyterian*, now deceased. Here he presents Christian faith and the justification which it brings as an exacting approach to every problem of human nature and historical destiny which really deals with the acute questions raised by the most piercing analysts of our culture. This is an exciting book, written with vigour and clarity.

Hope or Despair. By A. M. CARRE, O.P. 119 pp. Harvill. 10s. 6d.

Here is a powerful expression of Christian insights which are penetrating and overcoming the cult of despair. The author is an outstanding pastoral evangelist whose main activity today is in the university and theatrical spheres in France; but the book speaks clearly to anyone who has dipped into "the literature of darkness" with its message that our generation has to meet only one demand, "that it should get on equal terms with despair" (Albert Camus). Much credit must go to the translator, René Hague, for domesticating this book in Britain; but more goes to the author who has addressed himself surely and simply to the souls of adult Christians at the present crisis of European humanity and religion. The Roman Catholic allusions and theological bad habits which appear on the surface from time to time need not disturb the Protestant reader. Indeed, what is said within a Roman framework comes very close at times to bursting that framework by sheer Biblical power. Following St. Thomas, who attaches hope to the irascible faculty rather than the concupiscible, we are taught that the act of hope "mobilises the will's powers of energy, of boldness—and of anger." The source of this act, its vigour and its growth, are vividly presented, first in the soul as such and then in the soul as joined by baptism to a Journeying People, who move through a time which is not to

be despised because it is "the duration of the patience of a people on the march." Legitimate despair may be their lot in many respects, but they must meet and overcome a temptation to sinful despair, which is analysed both in respect of temptation and of commission. Filial "fear of the Lord" can overcome the ills by which hope is attacked, presumption and despair, and this "means to safety" is also subjected to powerful analysis. The present reality of Christian religion is exposed in its strength and weakness at a key point in this most sympathetic book, by a writer who never lets us "doubt the power of the gift of God," but who takes human experience into most careful account.

Moral Judgment. By D. DAICHES RAPHAEL. 224 pp. Allen & Unwin. 16s.

This book, the importance of which for professional moral philosophers goes without saying, is extremely illuminating for the amateur who can pick up the very explicit allusions to Moore, Ross, Carritt and Ewing. It offers a very lucid clarification of this field of inquiry, though R. M. Hare's *Language of Morals* is an indispensable complement to it. Part One sorts out the logic of moral concepts, with a careful eye on the two tests of coherence and of accord with the meaning of commonsense moral statements made by most men in certain situations. Dr. Raphael maintains that there are two sets of terms, whose relations he works out in a refined version of the Ross-Carritt deontologist tradition: (i) obligations, duties, claims and rights; (ii) fittingness and good—fittingness being adopted from Ewing without his intention of treating it as the sole ultimate ethical notion. These terms are then shown to be sufficient ethical equipment by which to deal with the complex appeal to justice and the concepts of desert and equality (explained in connection with liberty) which that appeal entails. The bearing of the principles of justice is chiefly to "protect the individual irrespective of general utility." All this prepares the way for alternative statements of an orderly scheme of moral concepts and principles, which leads to the more speculative enquiry undertaken in Part Two. Dr. Raphael calls this the "metaphysic of morals" in distinction from the logic. He works out his theory of moral obligation, which is Kantian in character. We ought to treat other persons as ends in the way we naturally treat ourselves as ends. Within the inter-personal ties in which we find ourselves, we are moved to "sympathetic representation in imagination of another's interests which we can help to satisfy"; and this conation is what is referred to by the idea of moral obligation. By this theory, the presence together in the logic of morals of different concepts and principles is rendered more intelligible than is usual with deontological approaches, and the common type of intuitionism associated with these approaches is not invoked. The relation of this moral theory to epistemology is discussed in a separate chapter. Then the question is raised about testing this account against alternative policies of action, and the book ends with a chapter on the consistency of the moral presuppositions thus exposed with presuppositions of thought in other fields, notably in the field of natural science. This is a lively and satisfying book which sheds an abundance of light on this high matter of deliberate human action.

An Introduction to Organic Philosophy. By LAWRENCE HYDE. Pp. xi + 201. Omega Press. 15s.

Mr. Hyde's *Organic Philosophy* is the product of careful and sensitive reflection on the separate moments of human experience which demand

to be integrated into a satisfying whole. The integration which he seeks to communicate has come to him (if his penultimate chapter is in some sense autobiographical) by the cultivation of "spiritual receptiveness" which enabled him to cross the Threshold to a condition of illumination where he realises how "the universal and the particular, the cosmic and the personal, the formal and the qualitative, the masculine and the feminine aspects of being are in essence one." This process of spiritual growth, called liberation and regeneration, brings us to recognise that "we are all the time in subjective association with discarnate minds which are impressing their ideas upon us without our (usually) recognising the fact." Its peace and stability rest upon the fact that one has associated oneself with the Absolute in an interior and intuitive mode.

W. A. WHITEHOUSE.

Aristotle's Metaphysics. Edited and translated by JOHN WARRINGTON. 888 pp. Dent: Everyman's Library. 7s.

Sir David Ross has described the *Metaphysics* as expressing "not a dogmatic system but the adventures of a mind in its search for truth"; and these adventures have had such profound and far-reaching effects upon Western culture that it is altogether fitting that Everyman's Library should celebrate its fiftieth anniversary by publishing this as its thousandth volume.

Anyone who sets out to provide a readable version of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* has several formidable tasks on hand. The structure of the work as a whole, its style, and the internal arrangement of some of the books, conspire to demand something more than 'mere' translation if non-technical readers are to be attracted. Accordingly the editor has rearranged the text, relying very closely upon the researches of Sir David Ross: this enables him to furnish the text with some kind of logical order. Again, since Aristotle's method of exposition was complex, and his language often over-terse, each chapter (or group of chapters) has been provided with a heading, so that the stages of the argument are more easily detected; and with the same end in view more modern ways of referring to previous parts of the argument have been used. As far as actual translation is concerned, Mr. Warrington has taken as his aim "to render the content of Aristotle's words into reasonably fluent English, and in the simplest form possible compatible with a translation as distinct from a mere paraphrase." In this he may be judged to have succeeded well, although not even the greatest felicity of translation will make the *Metaphysics* an easy book to study. This work invites comparison with the work Sir J. A. K. Thomson did recently on the *Ethics*: together they make Aristotle a more accessible figure to the modern man who has still much to learn, from Greek philosophy in general, and Aristotle in particular.

JOHN HUXTABLE.

The Christian Faith. By DAVID H. C. READ. 175 pp. Teach Yourself Books. English University Press. 6s.

Unlike canasta or the calculus, Christianity is not a subject for instruction, yet it is possible to learn what the Christian faith is about. Mr. Read makes a splendid beginning by dismissing the idea that faith is a matter of the individual's temperament which allows a man to add to the normal equipment of life a set of comforting convictions about an unseen world. The Christian faith has been professed by an extraordinary variety of people and not simply by a religious élite, and the author shows that the

Gospel is not a series of speculations about an invisible world, but an affirmation concerning this present life which can be transformed in response to the action of the living God. After discussing the basis of belief, we are drawn into encounter with Jesus Christ, and in two subsequent chapters—The Disclosure of God, and The Deliverance of Man—the reader is confronted with Christ's inescapable questions, 'Who am I?' and 'What am I doing?' It is gratifying to find that the book does not reflect an emphasis upon Christology to the neglect of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit; for here, the doctrine is divested of ecstasy and woolliness, and the Holy Spirit shown to be the power which animates both the facts of Christ and Christian men. "The Holy Spirit is God in action here and now, bringing us, through repentance and faith in Christ, into that status of sonship where we are free to obey the Father" (p. 113). The remaining chapters on The Trinity, Church and Sacraments, and The Destiny of Man are lucid statements; and the whole, extremely well fashioned to explain the faith to inquirers, will also present a clear, readable and balanced view of it to those already claiming to be adherents. CONRAD BONIFAZI.

Calvin's Doctrine of the Last Things. By HEINRICH QUISTORP. 200 pp. Lutterworth. 20s.

One of the chief merits of this interesting book, apart from the fact that the title is an accurate description of the contents, is that it shows quite clearly that this aspect of Calvin's teaching is essential to his theology as a whole. Not only can it be said that "Calvin's theology is Christology; this is equally true of his eschatology" (p. 22), but it must be added that to Calvin the second coming of Christ is "the meaningful goal of the whole work of Christ because it properly consummates our redemption" (p. 147).

The book is divided into three sections, the first of which is concerned with our hope of eternal life in Jesus Christ. This is the basis of all Christian living now, for it makes for a character active in combating evil and passive in cross-bearing and suffering. The second section on the immortality of the soul, to which Calvin accords an essential existence apart from the body, is particularly interesting for the tension which it exhibits as resulting from Calvin's allowing "his personal leaning towards a doctrine of survival and immortality to be checked by the command of the Bible and its message of resurrection" (p. 89). The result is a spiritualising tendency, also evident in the third section on the General Resurrection, which has been, at least in part, responsible for that individualistic conception of the future life which comes to the fore in some later Protestant theologies with the consequent loss of a true eschatological sense. It is also clear, however, that Calvin's formulation of his doctrine of the last things was affected by his opposition both to the Roman doctrine of purgatory and to the apocalyptic fanaticism of some of the wilder sects.

The book, here translated from the original German by Dr. Harold Knight, is a valuable addition to recent studies of the theology of Calvin. It contains many quotations including a considerable number from Calvin's commentaries, and it is to be regretted, therefore, that no index of quotations is provided which would increase its value as a book of reference. There is a subject index.

The foreword by Professor T. F. Torrance is in itself a commendation of the book, but one would like to know more of the author, Heinrich Quistorp, than that he is Lic. theol. RONALD BOCKING.

Charles I and the Puritan Upheaval : a Study of the Causes of the Great Migration. By ALLEN FRENCH. 436 pp. Allen & Unwin. 30s.

The writer of this study was on the staff of Harvard University and wrote several books on American history. After writing the present book, on which he had worked for ten years, he died. That was ten years ago, and the book now appears as revised by his widow. This melancholy circumstance perhaps explains why it reads rather flatly and in places more like materials for a book than a finished work. It is worth reading, especially the last third of it ; although what one gains is not altogether what the author purposed to give.

His purpose was to demonstrate that, while the economic motives behind the Puritans' departure to New England, latterly much emphasized, were present, the religious motives always assumed in earlier accounts were in no way lacking. To show these religious motives at work among ministers is not difficult, and the author does it effectively, giving a chapter each to Charles Chauncy and Samuel Ward as types of the men who objected to the reintroduction of communion rails—"What is here but the Masse itself, for here is all the furniture of it?"—and could not tell "whether such prayed at all that never prayed but out of a book." What one wants to know, however, is how great a part these religious motives played among the laymen who emigrated. Few of them wrote apologies and their identification with those tried in the ecclesiastical courts is somewhat chancy. Here it cannot be said that the author contributes much.

What he does provide is a very full account of the social, economic and political background of the emigrants, "not from the middle class up but, barring the very poor, from the middle class down": 'The Country Classes,' 'Reading and the Family,' 'Two Important Trades' and 'The Plague' are the titles of four of his chapters. If the book finds the right readers, much gratitude may be felt for the enormous labour expended in extracting details from the *Calendars of State Papers Domestic*; for, for every ten people interested in the Puritans, a hundred are interested in the common man.

The Restoration of Charles II (1658-1660). By GODFREY DAVIES. 383 pp. San Marino: Huntington Library. London: Geoffrey Cumberlege. 55s.

With this book a remarkable enterprise is concluded. As long ago as 1863 S. R. Gardiner published the first two volumes of his *History of England from 1603*. By 1901 he had published sixteen volumes; but when in the following year he died, his account was left unfinished at the year 1656. In 1909 C. H. Firth carried it forward, as Gardiner wished, as far as Cromwell's death in 1658; but he in turn went no further. Before his death in 1936 he asked the author of the book under review to complete the *History to 1660*. Its publication a quarter of a century later fulfils Firth's request. Its subject, strictly, is less the Restoration than the remaining months (September 1658—May 1660) of the Interregnum.

A work with such a pedigree, itself so long reflected upon, must command respect from the outset; and, unless its readers find high seriousness dull and objective narration flat, it will retain their respect to the end. In the main, it is a constitutional and military history. "Nothing is more remarkable during the interregnum than the lasting attachment to the principle of representative government"; but when Richard Cromwell was proclaimed Protector, the army received "what almost amounted to

an official recognition as a kind of estate of the realm"; and in the quick succession of his Protectorate, the Rump's restoration, the army leaders' *coup d'état*, the Long Parliament's recall, the Scottish army's march on London and the election of the Convention Parliament, the uneasy continuing factor was the struggle between military rule and some sort of constitutional government. The alignment of the Congregational leaders, and of John Owen in particular, with the army officers is brought out clearly and goes far to justify the political fear of the 'fanatics' evident after the Restoration: "in order that the Saints, a small minority, might be preserved," Owen "was willing to submit to military dictatorship." "The constant interference of the army in politics" is pronounced the greatest evil created by the Puritan Revolution, and "anti-militarism was strong and growing stronger." In the event, it was a General who engineered the Restoration; but it was Monck's remarkable achievement that "his step-by-step strategy did keep the restive army under control and did avoid bloodshed."

Monck seems to be the only character who succeeds in winning the writer's respect, and even Monck "tried to lull his opponents by deception." "The hour demanded a resolute leader"; but Richard Cromwell was "fearful and unresolved" and "continued to drift until upon the rocks," 'Milksop' Fleetwood was "a pliant reed" and Hesilrige was "stiff-necked and narrow-minded," while Lambert "never stood for any cause but his own advancement." "Oliver Cromwell's greatness is never so apparent as when the period immediately following his death is studied . . . he appears a colossus beside his successors." This at least, out of a somewhat melancholy conclusion to his *History*, would surely have pleased Gardiner and Gardiner's ancestors, Bridget Ireton and the Lord Protector himself.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

The Lord's Horseman: John Wesley the Man. By UMPHREY LEE. 189 pp. Hodder & Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

Christianity according to the Wesleys. By FRANZ HILDEBRANDT. 88 pp. Epworth. 7s. 6d.

Selected Letters of John Wesley, edited by F. C. GILL. 244 pp. Epworth. 15s.

Christ's Standard Bearer: a study in the hymns of Charles Wesley. By G. H. FINDLAY. 75 pp. Epworth. 7s. 6d.

Dr. Lee of Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, has added one more to the scores of 'lives' of John Wesley. It must be said, however, that this is more lively than most and is an excellent study of 'Wesley the man.' It is something of a relief to have John Wesley presented in this human aspect with "nothing extenuate nor aught set down in malice," not even in regard to his love affairs. He really was an astonishing person and needs no halo to make him a great man. Dr. Lee brings out well his versatility and restless energy as well as the hold he had over the members of his society. His writing, advising, organising, preaching were done while he was almost continually on the move. "The Lord's Horseman" is a good title, for it is a true description.

Dr. Hildebrandt was a German Lutheran pastor in Cambridge during the war where he became a convert to Methodism. Like many converts he outdoes in uncritical enthusiasm those who are natives of the soil, and he is just a little apt to assume that he alone understands the real original Methodism of the founder. It was, he says, a religion of 'the open Bible'

—a position from which Dr. Hildebrandt seems to think that modern Methodism has retreated. John Wesley highly esteemed Bengel's *Gnomon*, "and maybe that from there Methodism will be brought to a new appreciation of this much neglected and much maligned standard book of our doctrine." Dr. Hildebrandt takes four aspects of Wesley's preaching scriptural, practical, missionary and Catholic, none of which except the last exhibits any theological difference from the preaching of, say, William Grimshaw or any other evangelical of the Anglican type. On the last point, however, Dr. Hildebrandt puts out a strong case against reuniting with the Anglicans on the basis of episcopacy.

Mr. Gill has produced an entirely admirable book, satisfying both to the student of Methodist origins and also to the casual reader who can dip in anywhere and find interest and entertainment. More than 2,700 letters of John Wesley are contained in the standard edition and from them Mr. Gill has made a judicious selection of 275 arranged in chronological order from 1721 to 1791, with most useful prefatory notes. They exhibit Wesley in all his moods and in relation to all manner of people and situations—his family, his preachers, working folk and aristocrats, crises in his 'societies,' and his many worries about women, not least his wife. They show his shrewd common sense where his own personal emotions are not aroused, and his occasional lack of it when they are, but he always writes with vigour and frankness on every subject from tea drinking to theology. He did, of course, dislike criticism, and he loved managing other people's lives for them and laying down the law; his letters indicate both characteristics. But they also show a more lovable and compassionate side. Nothing, for instance, could be more full of Christian charity than his letter to his society at Keighley concerning an old preacher whom they had expelled (191).

Mr. Findlay's little book is an interesting study of the form and content of Charles Wesley's hymns. He illustrates Wesley's use of metre, his favourite verbs 'love' and 'prove' and "an important noun: nature." He chiefly goes back to the hymn book of 1876 and to John Wesley's famous preface to the original collection, and he quotes Bernard Manning's well-known book on the subject.

A. VICTOR MURRAY.

A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland. By WILLIAM D. MAXWELL. 190 pp. O.U.P. 15s.

Dr. Maxwell has put us much in his debt by writing a scholarly yet eminently readable and fascinating book. Based on the Baird Lectures for 1952-3, it contains six chapters in which the author reviews the worship of his church from the earliest times to the present day. The chapter headings indicate its scope: 'The Early Worship of Celts and Scots'; 'Mediaeval Worship in Scotland'; 'The Reformation of Worship'; 'Worship and the Covenants'; 'Worship after the Restoration'; and 'The Renaissance of Worship.'

The oldest liturgy reflecting Celtic usage is that contained in the Stowe Missal and Dr. Maxwell gives a description of what worship in 'a great church' will have been like in Scotland from the eighth to the tenth centuries. For the worship of the Reformation period he provides a wealth of detailed information and adds valuable references in footnotes.

A considerable feature of public worship in Scotland for more than two centuries after the Reformation was the exercise of discipline 'in the face of the congregation' on Sunday mornings. The 'repentance stool' in which offenders were placed was normally a large raised and railed platform, often

of pulpit height. The penitents stood there in sack-cloth throughout the sermon, after which the minister publicly admonished them.

Dr. Maxwell's profound knowledge of his subject and his careful scholarship are apparent on every page of this book, which can be warmly commended to scholars and general readers alike. On p. 176 read Dr. John Macleod.

JAMES M. TODD.

The Convocations and South India. By E. L. MASCALL. 20 pp. Mowbray. 1s.

As a Congregationalist, with personal experience of the Church Union negotiations in South India, I find this pamphlet most difficult to review. It sets out to answer the question: What did the Convocations (of Canterbury and York) decide, and how does their decision affect the Catholicity of the Church of England? Dr. Mascall maintains that the nine resolutions passed affirm the fundamental Catholicity of the Church of England, and he therefore seeks to persuade to this point of view those who feel that the resolutions passed indicate a virtual abandonment by their Church of any claim to Catholicism.

Dr. Mascall is strongly of the opinion, and he is not alone in this, that the method of approach to Church Union in South India is thoroughly undesirable, ambiguous, and ought never to have been followed at all. The latest resolutions of the Convocations still do not recognize the Church of South India as a fully constituted branch of the Catholic Church. The Church of England will not agree as yet to full communion with it. It views the present relationship as one of fellowship and growing inter-communion as between living parts of the Church of Christ. But it cannot recognize the C.S.I. as a branch of the Catholic Church until, firstly, the unification of the ministry through episcopal ordination is complete, and secondly, the problem of the two as yet unreconciled principles of a united ministry and full communion with non-episcopal churches is resolved.

To a non-Anglican, this seems to mean "until the C.S.I. becomes a fully Catholic Church such as the Church of England claims to be." As long as the C.S.I. holds, as it must according to its present Constitution, that a non-episcopally ordained minister can validly administer the sacraments of the Church, and as long as it maintains inter-communion with non-Catholic Churches, so long will the present impasse remain. But if the C.S.I. abandons these two points, the whole point of Union is lost.

The word 'Catholic' is used in the narrowest sense. It is clearly stated by Dr. Mascall that the English Free Churches lack the essentials of Catholicism. Moreover, the Protestant character of the Church of England is frankly denied. "It is monstrous to suggest that the Church of England has abandoned its Catholic character and simply thrown in its lot with Protestantism." Free Churchmen must be puzzled to know when the established Church of England ceased to be Protestant.

A careful study of this Pamphlet should open the eyes of all who are actively seeking Church Union with the Anglicans to the irreducible demands of the Church of England before Union can be acceptable to them. Protestantism must be abandoned; the validity of our ministries denied; communion with other Protestant Churches broken off. Is it worth this price?

H. V. MARTIN

RELIGION

LIFE AND WORK

Free Church Unity. E. K. H. JORDAN. 254 pp. Lutterworth. 12s. 6d.

Dr. Jordan's book, which rests on research done for the Oxford D. Phil. degree, is a history of the Free Church Council Movement from 1896-1941 ; and it is now published in the year of the Free Church Federal Council's Diamond Jubilee.

The older generation will delight in the record of the giants that used to be in the land and the 'battles long ago' which they fought ; and the younger generation will be grateful for so clear and reliable an account of those early days, when C. A. Berry, Hugh Price Hughes, John Clifford, and Thomas Law were national figures, swaying immense power. Dr. Jordan deals with the Free Church witness in such matters as education, social problems, the quest for peace and Christian unity ; and throughout the reader is aware that his guide knows the way.

What emerges from the story is that the Free Church Council came into being because a prophetic group of enthusiasts persuaded a large number of their fellow Nonconformists to work together in the cause of evangelism and with the hope that the way might open up for a United Free Church. The simultaneous missions accomplished great good ; but nothing comparable has been seen since. As for the ideal of Free Church unity, it seems to have faded into a mere contentment to get on together as we are. Indeed it is hard not to read Dr. Jordan's book as the record of a sad decline. It is, admittedly, easy to be wise after the event ; but it seems plain that the policy of Passive Resistance was probably mistaken, just as it seems certain that the Free Churches have paid for their much too close alliance with the Liberal Party by sharing its eclipse: indeed, one gets an impression of political naiveté on the part of some of the protagonists in the struggle.

This book must make solemn reading in the year of Jubilee, for while we may without misgiving praise the famous men that begat us, confusion of face belongs to us when we ask what of the future. The Free Church Federal Council is in a strikingly similar position to the Labour Party : it has achieved a great deal of its initial task ; but it has not rethought its tasks in the changed scene. The old shibboleths have no power ; many of the old negations are no longer relevant. It is significant that the Free Church Movement no longer calls forth the service of such men as C. A. Berry and Hugh Price Hughes: the leaders today serve their own Communion more than the F.C.F.C. What does this mean ? Can it be that in these days of wider sympathies the F.C.F.C. is thought to be too small a canvas ? Is it that we no longer believe in Free Church Unity, being merely content to use the device of federation as a tabernacle in which to cherish nostalgic memories of a great vision ? Or is it that we are waiting for some prophet to speak a liberating word which shall galvanize us into the passionate believing out of which the Free Church Movement was born ?

It is a measure of the great distinction of Dr. Jordan's book that it makes a prophetic record of history : it makes us search our hearts for an answer to the question how to fashion a future worthy of such a past.

JOHN HUXTABLE.

The Claims of Christ. By HUGH MARTIN, 118 p.p. S.C.M. Press. 7s.

It is not uncommon to meet people who argue that Christ never claimed to be divine. Any one who will take the trouble to read this book and look up the Biblical references will be left in no doubt as to the answer. In the first section of the book, Dr. Martin shows how the earthly life of Jesus is vital to the Christian faith. Here again he helps us to answer those who argue that it doesn't really matter whether Jesus really lived or not. He quotes with approbation Denny's sentence: "We know Him better than anybody who has ever lived on earth." In a discussion of the character of the fourth Gospel he sums it up in the telling phrase—"the memories of an eye-witness inspiring the meditations of a thinker." In setting out the claims of Jesus Dr. Martin not only considers the titles which He used, such as 'the Son' and 'the Son of Man,' but also the tremendous assumption which He made when He claimed the complete service of men. He amended the Law of Moses with the calm assurance of one who had a perfect right to legislate for the moral life of men. In the prayer which He taught His disciples He instructed them to ask for a forgiveness which He never seemed to need. The cumulative effect of the many points cited by Dr. Martin is most convincing.

CHARLES HAIG.

The Ministry of our Churches. The Moderators. Independent Press. 1s.

It is to be hoped that all concerned for the future of Congregationalism will read this plain-spoken booklet, in which the combined knowledge and wisdom of our Moderators is focussed upon one of our most urgent problems. It is an admirable reminder of the various parts of the ministry; and part of its strength is that it clearly relates the work of a Minister with 'lay' leadership. A series of graphs discloses certain alarming facts about the numerical strength of our ministry and the intake of candidates for the ministry either through our Colleges or through the Union Examinations. It is clear that the period of our decline is by no means over: there are fewer Churches, fewer ministers and fewer theological students than there were in 1935. Perhaps the decline in the number of our Churches is less alarming, for it is manifest that some of our Churches are so weak as to be not much loss when they are closed; and perhaps we have to face a still further and even sharper decline in the near future. If this prospect is to be averted, our Churches need to be led by an adequately equipped ministry, properly related to appropriate lay leadership; and we need to put the challenge of the Christian ministry before our ablest young people. There are encouraging signs that, when this is done, they are not unprepared to forsake worldly prosperity for the austere security of the ministry. If this booklet is read by Ministers, they will be led to rededicate themselves to their holy calling; if it is studied by laymen, they will come to a clearer understanding of what to expect (and what not to expect) from their ministers; and they will know more clearly what a great calling awaits those who are prepared to accept its responsibilities.

JOHN HUXTABLE.

Portrait of a Parson. By SUSAN MILES. 112 pp. Allen & Unwin. 10s. 6d.

It is difficult for a wife to write a balanced and objective study of her husband's life and character. Loyalty to the dead seems to demand that his failings should be glossed over, and partisanship may seek to make him

a bigger man than he really was. Susan Miles has avoided these pitfalls and has written a sensitive and vivid account of her late husband William Corbett Roberts.

To say that he was a Socialist, feminist and pacifist might seem to classify him as something like the clergyman in Shaw's *Candida*, but he emerges as a real man whose loyalty to Christ as the Way, the Truth and the Life was the dominating motive in his life and thought. It was no wonder that a town parson with leftish views should meet with misunderstanding and opposition in a country parish. The great period of his life was as rector of St. George's, Bloomsbury, for twenty-one years. His intelligence, unconventionality and love of people made just the right mixture for that cosmopolitan parish.

The thinker was never submerged in the parish priest. Roberts retained his interest in theology to the last. He set such a high value on the work of Drs. Dodd, Taylor and Micklem that he wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury suggesting that they should be offered Lambeth degrees. He believed the common Free Church saying 'This is the Lord's Table, not ours' to be true, and advocated intercommunion as a way to unity.

CHARLES HAIG.

The Salt of the Earth. ANDRE FROSSARD. 160 pp. Harvill. 10s. 6d.

This is a sympathetic and at times amusing account of the monastic life, written by one who has observed various Orders, especially in France. His object is to show what aims the monastic life has in view, and how the various Orders, whose characteristics are here described, attempt to achieve them. This is a book for popular consumption; and, while not many Protestants are likely to read it, there might be some useful discipline in seeking a sympathetic if not consenting awareness of the monastic ideal.

JOHN HUXTABLE.

Brother Edward. By KENNETH PACKARD. 168 pp. Bles. 12s. 6d.

"The world knows nothing of its greatest men" writes Lord Elton in his foreword to this book. This is truly spoken so far as Brother Edward is concerned, for your reviewer, for one, had never heard of him. The portrait of him at the beginning of this book reminds me of another great and unusual Christian, C. F. Andrews. Of both these men their friends could say, "The most Christlike man I know."

Brother Edward felt himself called to be an evangelist. He could not settle down to work in a parish nor even to be a member of a Religious Community. He must be free to go wherever God called him. It was not his vocation to nurture Christians in the faith but to call them to come face to face with Christ as Saviour and Lord. He was one who sowed beside many waters, leaving others to reap the harvest. Complete devotion to Christ ruled his whole life. He gave away £3,000, his share in his father's estate, as soon as he received it. He trusted God to provide for his bodily needs. Sometimes he was hungry and footsore, sometimes he slept in a barn or casual ward. Wherever he went he made Christ more real to those whom he met.

CHARLES HAIG.

Knife and Life in India by T. Howard Somervell (Livingstone Press, 10s. 6d.) was first published in 1940, but the greater part of the first edition was destroyed by enemy action. Since then, Dr. Somervell has had 15 years' further experience in medical and church work in South India, the later part at the Vellore Medical College, and under the new Church of

South India. Alterations and substantial additions have therefore been made to the original edition, forming a wonderful record of a great life of Christian service of a unique kind.

Toward a Theology of Mission by Wilhelm Andersen (S.C.M., 8s.) is an International Missionary Council pamphlet with the sub-title 'A Study of the Encounter between the Missionary Enterprise and the Church and its Theology.' At the Willingen meeting in 1952, the searching debates on this theme did not reach the stage of agreed conclusions. Dr. Andersen seeks to carry on the debate in the light of previous developments from Edinburgh 1910, through Jerusalem 1928 and Tambaram 1938, and then to point forward to possible lines of development in the reformation of a theology of missions. The most interesting part to the present reviewer is the study of Hoekendijk's criticism of the Church-centred orientation of the missionary enterprise. His dictum that "in history a keen ecclesiological interest has almost without exception been a sign of spiritual decadence" needs serious attention by church leaders.

Six Great Missionaries (Hamish Hamilton, 10s. 6d.) by Phyllis Garlick (illustrated with maps and six portraits) is a stirring book of over 200 pages, most understandingly written for the average reader. Here are stimulating character studies of five men and one woman, all of whom were outstanding Christian missionaries, each in a different way. Their greatness is not just in what they did, but more especially in the quality of life which they actively expressed. The six selected are Francis Xavier, John Wesley, Alexander Mackay, Wilfred Grenfell, Ida Scudder, and Albert Schweitzer.

The Christian Church and Islam in West Africa by J. Spencer Trimingham (S.C.M., 3s.) is another I.M.C. Research pamphlet, setting forth the views and impressions of the author after a special twelve month survey undertaken in 1952 on behalf of two British Missionary Societies. Both Islam and Christianity are immigrant faiths in West Africa, and apparently the general effect of the adoption of Christianity does not seem to be any better than conversion to Islam. The author sets forth the relative influences of these two faiths upon West African societies, and seeks to present a re-appraisal of the Christian approach and a re-orientation of the Christian outlook. The study is primarily empirical, but the theological tension beneath cannot be hidden.

When I Die by Frederic Greeves (Foundry Pamphlets No. 2, Epworth Press, 1s.) is an exceedingly helpful little book on the Christian hope of Heaven. The three sections, originally B.B.C. Broadcasts, are entitled 'The Hope of Heaven,' 'The Resurrection of the Body,' and 'Looking Forward to Heaven.'

H. V. MARTIN.

Over the Hills and Home Again by Rita F. Snowden (Epworth, 5s.) is as good a book of talks to children as one could wish to see. It has the warmest commendation to all who engage in this responsible task.

Company Orders 1956 (Salvationist Press, 3s. 3d.) is a volume of Sunday School and Bible Class Lesson Notes. This is first-class material in rich abundance at a surprising price. Themes covered are Parables of the Kingdom, The Disciples, The Prophets, Paul, The Miracles.

What About These Jamaicans (Independent Press, paper, 2d.) is a lively pamphlet by Cyril T. Follett on a live topic. Discussion of it should prepare the way for a more Christian attitude and more Christian action where both are needed.

The revision and re-issue of some standard books on Sunday School work continues. We now have the 3rd edition of *The Secretary's Handbook* by E. H. Hayes and Roland Atkinson (R.E.P., paper, 3s.). It has proved its worth, packed as it is with sane instruction and advice.

The Gospel of Robinson Crusoe (Epworth, 5s.) by F. W. Boreham is fascinatingly fresh. Dr. Boreham starts from Defoe's own confession that in Crusoe he portrays his own inner struggle. With that clue in mind we are invited to consider Crusoe as Convert, Philosopher, Evangelist, Castaway and Mystic. A good essay has been spun out into rather a slight book.

The Pastoral Ministry of the Church by C. E. Surman (Independent Press, paper, 1s.). What G. K. Chesterton wrote of the New Testament, that any man reading it for the first time will feel as if rocks have been rolled down on him, will aptly describe the experience of a first reading of this book. Nine ministers out of ten will find it devastating because it says openly things they have hardly realized they are thinking. It is a searching and often scathing account of "the weakest part of our work," the pastoral ministry, and of the inadequacy of our preparation for it. It is easy to say that Mr. Surman treats one aspect of our work in isolation, that he does not allow sufficiently for a variety of callings within the ministerial vocation and that in spite of p. 17 he does not lay the blame for the present state of affairs heavily enough where it belongs. Apart from all that, what he says is of vital importance and all too true.

Congregationalism in Cornwall (Independent Press, paper, 2s. 6d.) by Richard Ball tells the story of the chequered history of our denominational witness in a unique setting. It might be a depressing story save for the author's faith and enthusiasm which make his last word one of "hope for the years to come."

100 Tales Worth Telling (Independent Press, 6s.) by A. D. Belden is the second impression of a book of material which is bound to be useful to all who are called upon to address children.

Prayers for Women's Meetings (Independent Press, paper 5s., cloth 6s.) by Fred Stafford is a revised and enlarged edition of a book which first appeared in 1942. Only a man of prayer could have written these 130 freshly worded prayers. They have been and will be found very helpful.

They Met at Calvary (Epworth, paper 3s. 6d., Linson 6s.) by W. E. Sangster is yet one more study of personalities of the Passion. Yet one more, but vigorous and stimulating in every line. It may be recommended for devotional reading and for study.

How many have heard of Sidney Clark, Rev. Roland Allen, and Dr. Thomas Cochrane? The many who have not are advised to secure **Thomas Cochrane** (Hodder & Stoughton, paper, 4s. 6d.) by Francesca

French. There is told the story of the man who was a founder of the Pekin Medical College, the World Dominion Press and the Mildmay Centre. It is a fine story, well told.

A Safe Stronghold (R.E.P., limp 4s., boards 5s.) by E. P. Dickie is a study in Christian Apologetics designed for students aged 12-16 and their teachers. The book falls into three parts, Christian Apologetics The Modern Challenge, and The All-Inclusive Answer. It covers the field but is never superficial and not often easy.

Discovering Christ (Independent Press, paper, 2s. 6d.) by K. R. Matthews is strongly recommended to all who work with young people. It outlines a way of approach to religious discussion in the club which the author actually followed.

A Guide to Pacifism (Michael Shelton and Murray, paper, 1s. 8d.) by J. F. T. Prince has the interest of coming from a Roman Catholic. Many will welcome the interesting, fresh enquiry into the pacifist case; but no one with historical judgment or knowledge will endorse the remarks about the origin of the last War, made by an Irish-American R.C. Bishop before America was involved, and quoted with approval. If Mr. Prince knew his Wheeler-Bennett, Taylor or Trevor-Roper he would have been better informed.

The Salvation Army believes in biography as a challenging revelation of what God can do through dedicated lives. It has plenty of material to use. We now have **T.H.K.** (Salvationist Press, paper 4s. 6d., cloth 7s. 6d.) by A. R. Wiggins. It is a life of Theodore Hopkins Kitching, the father of the present General. To read it is to walk with a good and great man.

Gentle Eagle (Salvationist Press, paper, 2s.) by Alfred Gilliard is a short life of an Alaskan Indian, Charles Newton, who gave forty years of devoted service among his own people.

Church Prospect (F.O.R., paper, 1s. 6d.) is the Alex Wood Memorial Lecture delivered by Dr. G. MacLeod. Impressed by the recent growth in the number of communities of *eccentrics*, Dr. MacLeod is convinced that they are to become *central*, the life-giving pattern of the new Christian Community with "a collective and not just spiritual mutual responsibility."

A Modern Catechism (Longmans, paper, 2s. 6d.) by Paul Welsby bears a deceiving title. This is simply the Prayer Book Catechism extended in places by additional Questions and Answers.

Best Sermons, 1955 Edition (McGraw-Hill, \$4.50), edited by Dr. G. Paul Butler, contains 52 sermons selected from over 7,500 submitted. Here are Catholic, Protestant and Jewish sermons by Americans, Greeks, Germans, English.

Hungry Men (Livingstone Press, paper, 5s.) by L. Hurst has already been reprinted, a striking tribute to a book which "offers a burden to all who will receive it," which deals with "certain grim and terrible facts about the life of the world today."

JOHN WILDING,

Everyman and Mediaeval Miracle Plays. Edited by A. C. Cawley. 266 pp. Dent: Everyman's Library. 6s.

The publication of this volume has done the churches a real service. Here are gathered together a representative collection of mediæval Biblical pageants which have been chosen for their intrinsic merit. They give a good idea of the range and content of an English Corpus Christi cycle. The editing of these plays is excellent. Archaic forms and spellings are modernised where possible. Difficult words and short phrases are glossed in the margin, while longer word-groups needing explanation are paraphrased in footnotes.

Steps in Bible Drama. By ROBERT DUCE. 98 pp. Independent Press. 6s.

Mr. Duce has written a book of practical help for those who wish to use religious drama in their work among young people. It is an excellent guide to both the kind of material in the Bible which is suitable for dramatisation and to the use of such material. The major part of the book is devoted to a consideration of the use of Biblical material in the classroom. In five chapters information and teaching is given on spontaneous play-acting, group play-making, dramatic story-telling and puppetry. What may be called 'worship drama' is dealt with in three chapters under the headings of Mime and Music.

Angels Unawares. By STUART B. JACKMAN. 64 pp. S.C.M. 4s.

Here is modern religious drama at its most forceful. The author takes a contemporary situation and shows the relevance of Christ's Passion to it. Peter Fisher is the leader of the local Communists. He sees in Communism new hope for the common man, a binding of him to his neighbour, and a chance for him to find his way into a better way of life. When we meet him he is a martyr of the Party, having been 'fired' because of his activity. Peter is an idealist and as such his whole being cries out in protest against the 'give me' and 'get' of the ordinary Party member. When a particularly ruthless action is decided upon in his absence, he refuses to have anything to do with it, though he is called a traitor to the Party. Events, however, compromise him and he stands back when an innocent Jew is taken by the police in his stead. The Jew is none other than Christ suffering for the world, and in His suffering, as Peter realises, redeeming men and women. The play is written for performance as a part of a church service.

JASON S. WRIGHT.

Independent Press has published three more 'Life Up Your Hearts' talks of the B.B.C.: **The Bible in People's Lives** by A. M. Chirgwin (1s.), real-life stories from history and the mission field; **World Family** by Cecil Northcott (1s.), a concise account of the work of the United Nations Organisation; and **A Word to the Worried** by Colin Kerr (8d.), meditations on John xiv.

Carey Kingsgate Press is publishing at 3d. each a useful set of pamphlets, 'The Advance Series.' Nos. 7, 8 and 9 deal with **The Devotional Life** (S. F. Winward), **The Office of a Deacon** (C. B. Jewson), and **The Work of a Sunday School Teacher** (Jessie Murphy).

Two more 'Beckly Occasional Papers' have appeared, dealing with **The Church in the New Age** (E. C. Urwin, 6d.) and **Houses and Homes** (E. Benson Perkins, 9d.). Both are published by the Epworth Press.

MISCELLANEA

The Self and the Dramas of History. By REINHOLD NIEBUHR. 264 pp. Faber and Faber. 21s.

God's Iron. By GEORGE A. BIRMINGHAM. 256 pp. Bles. 16s.

Yesterday, Today, and Forever. By MARIA AUGUSTA TRAPP. 191 pp. Bles. 12s. 6d.

One of the exhilarating things about Niebuhr's books is the realism with which he attacks historical and political problems. It is so easy to seek refuge in the facile pietism according to which we should all settle down nicely and find a universal solution to all our problems if we were all Christians. Apart from the improbability of this ever happening, this kind of pious belief simply is not true, for it fails to take account of the profound complexities in self and society which are the genesis of historical movements and tensions, or of the highly technical character of so many social and political problems. Early in his book Niebuhr warns his readers against the sentimentality of trying to transpose the individual conscience about collective morality into collective action; and bound up with this is his warning against regarding collective tensions as enlargements or projections on to society of the tensions suffered by individual selves. History, however, like Niebuhr's book, begins with the self, and therefore, if the 'dramas' of history are to be understood, there must be an analysis of the complex multirelationship of the self with other selves and the community.

Niebuhr considers that we are where we are because "modern culture marched inexorably towards the understanding of nature and the misunderstanding of man" (p. 128). The cumulative misunderstanding is the legacy of Descartes, Hobbes, the Enlightenment, nineteenth century liberalism and positivism, and, in its application to history, of Hegel and Marx. How true this is! And with it goes another truth—that modern culture has gone the wrong way because modern man has been more concerned with artifacts than with organism. Indeed, the dialectical tension in modern culture, according to Niebuhr, is between the dramatic and the organic (represented by the Hebraic) on the one hand, and structures and artifacts (represented by the Hellenic factor) on the other.

Niebuhr has much to say about the series self-community-world-community, on which matter his judgments are usually sound and often brilliant in their inclusive generalisations. He admires the solid British feeling for the organic, rightly attributes German political ineptitude to Luther's extravagant reverence for authority, and France's ineptitude both political and social to the results of the Enlightenment and to her failure to resolve the tensions set up by her Revolution. He admires Churchill, is doubtful about American capacity for world-leadership, and appositely quotes de Tocqueville's (1835) far-seeing prediction of the eventual emergence of the United States and Russia as the two great world powers. Biblical faith, Niebuhr concludes, can alone provide man, both in his solitary selfhood and when faced by his historical destiny, with an adequate sense of meaning.

This is a brilliant, penetrating, and timely book. Though written with more respect for syntax than is usual with Niebuhr, it is not free from lapses. On p. 148 he confuses singular and plural ("Modern anthropology. . . . They have not"); there is also some faulty syntax on p. 208; we have

"identical to" and, as usual, "inordinancy" instead of "inordinateness." The typical phrases and words such as "frames of meaning," "structures," "coherences," "pretensions," and "ambiguities" reappear with rather monotonous frequency. Niebuhr's strictures on "liberalism" follow the current fashion. What is wrong with the world, however, is lack of liberalism. What we need is more of it, both in theology and in politics. We are on the brink of the abyss because there is so little of it.

Jeremiah can be written about in two ways: as the subject of a fine novel such as Franz Werfel's *Hearken unto the Voice*, or as a biography. The late George A. Birmingham (Canon Hannay) has followed the latter method and in *God's Iron* has given us a sympathetic and faithful account of the prophet's life. Jeremiah was a concrete example of the "self and the dramas of history," for here, if anywhere, was a man who was involved in the great historical drama of his people and was engulfed in it, while at the same time transcending it. Canon Hannay's biography is a pleasant, readable account of the prophet, and is a reissue of the edition which was destroyed in the bombing of London.

Yesterday, Today, and Forever could only have been written by a Catholic, and an Austrian Catholic, too. The Trapps (parents and nine children) left the Tyrol to escape from Hitler's Austria, settled in America, and formed themselves into a family of singers who toured much of the world. In this second of her books Maria Trapp describes incidents from the life of Jesus against the background of the experiences of her family as refugees. Here again are individuals caught up in the historical drama and able to transcend its tragedy.

GERAINT V. JONES.

Reflections on Hanging. By ARTHUR KOESTLER. 193 pp. Gollancz. 12s. 6d.

To the Englishman who is proud of his country's legal system it comes as something of a shock to realize that in the 18th and early 19th centuries England's penal code was more brutal than any in Western Europe, and that today England is one of the last civilized countries to retain capital punishment. Mr. Koestler argues that this clinging to outdated notions is due to the undue influence exercised by the judges upon the development of English law. Bound by precedent they have always thrown their weight upon the side of the system which was already in being. This is the other side of that independence of the judiciary which has always enabled them to resist the encroachments of the executive upon the rights of the subject.

It is curious to note that the same kind of fears were expressed when the abolition of hanging for theft was being discussed as at the present day when capital punishment for murder is in question. Then the cry was "No man's property will be safe," today it is "We shall all be murdered in our beds." In fact there was no increase in crimes against property, and the evidence from abolitionist countries shows that the number of murders tends to decrease when capital punishment is abolished.

Mr. Koestler shows that the Timothy Evans case is not by any means the only one where it is more than likely that an innocent man was hanged. Identification parades and circumstantial evidence can be far from conclusive. It is only the abolition of the death penalty which can prevent the possibility of irremediable injustice.

Mr. Koestler has written a convincing and lively book, the only weak point of which is his discussion of free-will and determinism in chapter six. He is no cool, detached observer, but an advocate who makes no secret of

his strong feelings. Some readers may think that he treats the judges and the Home Office with scant respect, and that there is venom in his attacks on Lord Goddard; but it will be a bad day for England when periwigs and political power render office-holders immune from criticism.

CHARLES HAIG.

From Darkness to Light. By VICTOR GOLLANCZ. 668 pp. Gollancz. 15s.

The subtitle of this book—"a confession of faith in the form of an anthology"—sufficiently explains its purpose. Like Mr. Gollancz's previous anthology *A Year of Grace*, it is designed to be read from beginning to end as a consecutive whole, and only then to find its place with other anthologies on the bedside table.

A Year of Grace was positive in tone, an affirmation of Christian faith by a very unorthodox Christian. *From Darkness to Light* is, in part at least, negative; it treats of the dark night of the soul and of the difficult passage from despair to serenity. Together these anthologies form the testament of a man of deep feeling with an extraordinary knowledge of the byways as well as of the highroads of literature both sacred and profane. Besides a comprehensive and accurate index and an appendix of sources, this book contains a section entitled "Notes on Writers and Books." This is a valuable and indeed necessary addition, since it may be doubted whether any of his readers will, like the compiler, be on equally familiar terms with Hasidic Rabbis, Muslim mystics, Chinese philosophers and contemporary British, French and Russian poets and novelists.

Black Pearl: The Hairdresser from Haiti. By ARTHUR and ELIZABETH ODELL SHEEHAN. 208 pp. Harvill. 16s.

Pierre Toussaint, the subject of this biography, should not be confounded with his more celebrated namesake, Toussaint L'Ouverture. Both were born Negro slaves in the French island of Haiti within the same quarter of the eighteenth century; and both had kindly masters who encouraged their ambitions. But whereas L'Ouverture was to lead his fellows in revolt and die a prisoner of Napoleon, Pierre, a devout Catholic, taken to America and freed, remained devoted to the family which had owned him. He became a fashionable hairdresser in New York, prospered and lived to a serene old age, a much-loved philanthropist and an impartial benefactor of Blacks and Whites. It is an edifying and moving story, but scarcely of sufficient substance to justify a book of this length.

Lovers of poetry who find the work of most modern poets obscure and unrewarding will welcome Mr. Clive Sansom's *The Witnesses* (Methuen, 8s. 6d.). In this long poem or sequence of poems various characters in the Gospels, from 'a shepherd in Nazareth' to John and Judas, meditate upon the personality of Jesus from his or her own limited point of view. The title poem occupies about half the volume, the rest of which consists of occasional poems grouped under such headings as People, Places, Faith, Doubt, War. All these poems reveal a clarity of thought and a directness of feeling which make them especially suitable for reading aloud.

With its fiftieth anniversary the invaluable Everyman's Library reaches its 1,000th volume. No. 999 is *The Betrothed* (Dent, 7s.), a translation of Alessandro Manzoni's *I Promessi Sposi*. Though earlier than either (it was first published in 1827), this famous novel occupies in Italian

literature much the same place as *War and Peace* in Russian or *La Chartreuse de Parme* in French. At once a love-story and an historical study of seventeenth-century Europe, it has the same grandeur of conception, comprehensiveness of range and objectivity of outlook. Mr. Archibald Colquhoun's translation is excellent, and he contributes an informative preface.

P. A. SPALDING.

Teaching for Results. By FINDLEY B. EDGE. Nashville, Tennessee. 230 pp. \$3.

This is an honest book, by an expert in Sunday School work. He makes a case for more specific teaching aims, more purpose in Bible study and what he calls 'carry-over' from class to life. Much of his argument applies outside his Baptist seminary, outside the U.S.A. and outside Sunday Schools. His analysis of the learning process and of teaching techniques is admirable, and his book is the easier to read for his gift of summing up an attitude in a phrase or case. Our English methods could supply material for his neat summary of the way not to teach: "You sit still while I instil", as also could our large classes for the truth of his principle: "We must reach people before we can teach them." For effective teaching he relies on planned courses, related to the environment of the class, introduced by question and answer and enlivened by variety, novelty, shock, that may provoke personal reaction. We may smile at the last page, with its chart and monthly check-up on the teacher's 'weakest point,' until we sense the zeal behind its use: "With the names on your class-roll and this chart go to a quiet place to be alone with God. . . . Honestly and objectively go over each qualification and ask the question, 'How do I rate?'"

Understanding and Enjoyment. Books 2 & 3. By N. C. MARTIN and D. & A. GRIFFITHS. 190, 127 pp.

Comprehension and Precip. By E. FOERS and J. JONES. 141 pp.

Planned Interpretation. By N. F. DONALD and H. BELL. 232 pp. O.U.P. 5s. each.

These are the remaining four volumes of the Oxford Comprehension Course, of which the first was noticed in C.Q. last October (p. 382). In days of expensive books these admirable selections of texts supply the freshest stimulus and the best value I have met. Parents who wish to encourage tasteful and enjoyable reading, and incidentally to prepare themselves as intelligent companions of their children, could not do better than to buy the whole set. They will find in Book Two material from sources as varied as the *Times*, Day Lewis, Joyce Cary, T. E. Lawrence, Monsarrat and Balchin. They are free to disregard the questions and exercises set after each extract, but may find (as I did) that these suggest points missed on a quick first reading. The third volume deals with more factual prose and shows how the competent journalist manages to be informative without being dull or vague. These subjects are not literary and cover all tastes, e.g. law, kitchens, roads, gambling, design, highbrows. The method comes out best, as intended, in the final volume, in which the extracts illustrate types and qualities of prose. It is written in the conviction that "reading and writing are essential parts in the education of every one of us. They open up paths which lead to absorbing interest, to great beauty and to deep satisfaction." This seems to me entirely sound: if adult education could return to these paths, it might recover its soul.

W. G. MOORE.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (April) includes 'A Theologian looks at Prof. Toynbee's Philosophy of History' by Prof. Erich Roth; 'Prof. Toynbee, Mazzini and the Future Faith' by Gwilym O. Griffith; 'Marx and Science' by Dr. H. G. Wood; 'A Modern View of Sin' by Dr. E. L. Allen; 'Can a man witness his own Funeral?' by Prof. Antony Flew; 'Thoughts of a Jew on Dante's Divine Comedy' by Dr. Bruno Italiener; '1524 and 1537: Two early Hymnbooks' by Sydney H. Moore; 'Creation and the idea of Time' by Prof. J. Robson.

International Review of Missions (April) includes 'What doth the Lord require of us?' by Dr. Carl Michalson; 'The Missionary and the Cultures of Man' by Dr. Robert Parsons; 'Church and Evangelism' by Rev. H. D. L. Abraham; 'Freedom of Conversion: The Issue in India' by Dr. Chas. W. Forman; 'The Four Martyrs of Thana' by Prof. John Foster.

Scottish Journal of Theology (March) has 'Prolegomena to a Christian Ethic' by Prof. John Macmurray; 'The Authority of the Bible: 1. The Canon of Scripture' by Prof. J. R. Macphail and others; 'Gnosis and Revelation in the Bible' by Prof. Alan Richardson; 'Papias and the Four Gospels' by Rupert Annand; 'Job' by Dr. Harold Knight.

Expository Times (March) includes 'Were Paul's Imprisonment Epistles written from Ephesus?' by Prof. G. S. Duncan; 'Industrial Evangelism' by Dr. A. Skevington Wood; 'Reflections on Bultmann's Hermeneutic' by Prof. H. Thielicke; 'Christ's Challenge to Straight Thinking' by Rev. John Baker. (April) 'The Authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians' by Prin. C. Leslie Mitton; 'Joseph the Patriarch in Patristic Teaching' by Rev. A. W. Argyle; 'Bernard Shaw and the Preacher' by Rev. J. A. Davidson.

London Quarterly and Holborn Review (April) includes eight articles on various aspects of Methodism and Episcopacy. The familiar ground is well covered in preparation for the forthcoming discussions between Methodists and Anglicans.

Baptist Quarterly (April) includes 'The Church of Scotland on Baptism' by Prin. R. L. Child; 'Christian Platonism' by Prof. J. B. Skemp; 'Congo Protestant Missions and European Powers before 1885' by Ruth Slade (conc.); 'The Inspiration of the Bible' by Dr. J. R. C. Perkins (conc.).

Friends' Quarterly (April) includes 'An Appreciation of Friends' work in Madagascar' (written in 1877) by Lars Dahle; 'Nataanael Beskow' by Leif Eeg-Olofsson; 'Christianity and Nationalism in China' by Janet W. Rees.

Modern Churchman (March) includes 'The Legacy of the Reformation' by Prof. Norman Sykes; 'The Archaeologist and the Study of Church History' by Dr. W. H. C. Frend; 'New Horizons for Medicine and Christianity' by Prof. R. K. Harrison.

Theology (March) includes 'Fundamentalism' by the Bishop of Rochester; 'The Gospels and the Life of Jesus'—a review of Dr. Vincent Taylor's book—by Prof. D. E. Nineham; 'Preaching-Class Canons' by J. B. Paton are those still in use at Paton College, Nottingham. (April) 'The New Lectionary' by Dr. Mervyn Haigh; 'The Intellectual Vocation of the Christian' by Rev. B. M. G. Reardon; a new translation of 'The Dies Irae' by Dr. Austin Farrer.

Evangelical Quarterly (April-June) includes 'The Claim of Jesus Christ on Modern Education' by Prin. J. Chr. Coetzee; 'The Mandrake and the Ancient World' by Prof. R. K. Harrison; 'Augustine and the O. T. Canon' by Prof. S. J. Schultz; 'The Last of the Hallel Psalms' by Rev. T. Torrance; and a long review of Dr. Whale's *The Protestant Tradition*.

Review of Religion (March) has 'An Introduction to Taoist Yoga' by Chung-Yuan Chang; 'Faith and Reason in Kierkegaard and Modern Existentialism' by Prof. William W. Paul. There are 96 pages of Book Reviews.

Yale Review (Spring) includes 'American Diplomacy: The Case of "Amateurism"' by Seymour J. Rubin; 'American Culture Abroad' by Chester H. Opal; 'Communism in Southeast Asia' by Harry J. Benda.

Christian News-Letter (April) is an interesting number with 'The Kirkentag' by Rev. E. H. Robertson; 'The Problem of the Modern Hospital' by Dr. J. C. J. Burkens; 'D. H. Lawrence and the English Tradition' by Martin Jarrett-Kerr.

Religion in Education (Spring) includes 'Christian Education in the Secondary Modern School' by Dr. R. Perry; 'Asking the Right Questions' by Rev. Alan Shaw; 'Progress towards Church Unity' by Canon L. Hodgson. J.M.P.